

Geo. Ticknor

THE

CHRISTIAN DISCIPLE.

NEW SERIES—No. 13.

For January and February 1821.

HERDERS' LETTERS RELATING TO THE STUDY OF DIVINITY.

[Translated from the German.]

LETTER III.

Lowth's book on the sacred poetry of the Hebrews. Review of the Hebrew scriptures according to the Jewish division of them. On the oldest remains that concern the origin of the human race. The patriarchal history, and the style in which it is written.

You mistook me about Lowth. I love and value his book as agreeable and useful; and am not at all on the side of those, who think they can find all that he contains in their Glassius: Glassius had no such wide and elegant view of his subject. The prelections on the parabolic style of the Hebrews; on the metaphors, images and allegories, that are peculiar to them; and especially the descriptions of particular passages, and his remarks on them, are beautiful. In his beautiful latin they become still more charming; and with the notes of Michaelis, which often exceed the text, and are among his best productions, the work is a good general introduction to the poetical writings of the Old Testament. I would have you read it directly and become fond of it; and to these add two other*

* Sir William Jones' "Commentar. Poeseos Asiat. edit. Eichhorn, Leips. 1779;" and John Richardson's Essay on the literature, languages and customs of the Eastern nations, Leipsic 1779. If any will add to these my work on the spirit of the Hebrew poetry, I shall have nothing against it.—*Author's Note.*

[All the notes to the preceding letters were by the translator; and all in this and the future letters, which are not marked as the author's, will be known to be by the translator.]

New Series—vol. III.

books, which I account as equally serviceable in this study. And here let me tell you that I would not be considered as a critic in speaking of books and authors. I am writing letters to you, and not a review. I am no well appointed censor of works by profession, according to the received rules and spirit; but an old friend, who from the pleasant pilgrimage of his reading, his study, his occupation and life, tells you his experiences and opinions, as he tells them to himself, and then leaves them to your examination and approval. Of what use is it to name over books, or to give you long catalogues of them, without any true guide and direction how to read, to use, and to apply them? Seldom is all good in one book; seldom at least good for all persons. Time brings about many changes in books as in other things. The finest library wants an interpreter; and the best gift that a young man can receive is—not books, but advice how they are to be used.

What I objected, merely in passing, to Lowth, and which you must not stumble at, was the somewhat artificial and modern way, in which he has treated the old Hebrew poetry, sometimes in general, and sometimes in particular classifications and passages:—or rather I should say, in which some of his admirers have treated it, pushing his principles too far. According to the representation of these last, David composed this psalm as an idyl for his amusement, and that as an elegy for a youthful exercise; and the most earnest exhortations, denunciations and encouragements of prophecy, are but specimens of Hebrew didactics: I cannot express how much injury is done to the use of the Bible, by regarding it in this manner. It is a disordered function in the principal channels, so that the other vessels can give no nourishment: it is a false first principle, and corrupts and perverts all the rest. The poetry of the Bible was not designed for pastime, nor for an idle mental recreation, still less in the way of paltry common place, as poetry is apt to be among ourselves: indeed we can hardly give the same name to things so entirely and essentially different. Poetic expression, the manner of conceiving and executing, was in those times all nature; the very exigency of the language and feeling of him who spoke, and of the ear and feeling of those who listened;—the necessity of the subject, the time, the object and the circumstances. I do not say this because I am speaking of the Bible; but because I am speaking of the infancy of the world, of the east, of a peculiar language, of a peculiar people and their writings. Here we have need of a new Lowth, who should know nothing of the artificial poetry of later times, to go through this collection of compositions

from the beginning, and to point out in each and in every part of each its simplest design and scope. It may not be unwelcome to you to have a few thoughts of mine on this subject, so far as they may be comprised in a letter. They confirm my first position, that the Bible must be read as a *human* work : and it seems to me, that the great diversity of the contents of the scriptures leads us directly to such a position. Twenty-two or twenty-four books,* embracing a history of 3500 years, the authors of which stand a thousand years apart from each other, and those authors sometimes wholly unknown, and sometimes assumed to be almost as many as there are books ;—such a harvest of times, writings, subjects and authors, cannot be bound together with a wisp of straw :—and it is but dreaming in the dark to read through such a book in one breath and as one lesson.

I begin with no animating appeal. I shall be animated sufficiently by my love for you ; and may your regard for me turn these pages into a muse, who will stand by you as a friend during your still reading of the oldest and most venerable writings in the world, and whisper something of confidential instruction.

We have received this rich collection of books from the *Hebrews* ; and I think they should be followed in the division of them. Not that we are here concerning ourselves about degrees and differences of inspiration ; but their division into the law, the prophets, and the holy writings, furnishes us with hints how and when these books were written, and how they were estimated by the people who were entrusted with them.†

* According to Josephus (*Contra Apion* 1. § 8,) the sacred books of the Hebrews were twenty-two in number. There seems to have been no better foundation for this division, than that such was the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. At least so we are told by Origen and other Christian fathers. The Talmud reckons twenty-four books as canonical : this was after the Rabbins, who were always trifling with their letters and scriptures, had added a double to the doubled ψ .

† This seems to be overrating very much the value of the Jewish division of the Old Testament. That division, though extremely ancient, was really a very inconvenient one ; and has given rise to various classifications of the Hebrew Scriptures. The arrangement of Josephus is this : 1. The law : five books of Moses. 2. The prophets : thirteen books. 3. The holy writings, or Hagiographa ; (as they have been called since the days of Epiphanius, before whose time they do not appear to have had any appropriated appellation,) four books. He does not tell us how the several books should fall under their respective heads : and the subject has been the occasion of much dispute. Origen, (born A. D. 185, died A. D. 253,) has undertaken to inform us : but it is wholly uncertain from what sources he drew his opinion. According to him, the books under the second class are : 1. Joshua, 2. Judges and Ruth, 3. two books of

The Law of Moses was the root of their legislation and religion; this and the most ancient history of the nation were contained in his books. The earlier prophets (the books from Joshua to Kings) are a continuation of this history; and are so called because it was believed, and doubtless on good grounds, that prophets collected this history, and added it to that of Moses. The later prophets are those, which we call simply the prophets, Daniel alone excepted. These were prized as the interpreters of the divine will; as they who were to apply the Mosaic law to particular exigences of the state, to seasons and situations. Certainly in this sense, which does not demand what is properly called prophesying, Daniel claims no place among them; but in the meaning, which we commonly affix to the word prophet, he takes a high rank, being wholly conversant with the things of futurity.* Those prophets stood up

Samuel, 4. two books of Kings, 5. two books of Chronicles, 6. Ezra and Nehemiah, 7. Esther, 8. Isaiah, 9. Jeremiah and Lamentations, 10. Ezekiel, 11. Daniel, 12. the twelve minor prophets, 13. Job. Those under the third class, are 1. Psalms, 2. Proverbs, 3. Ecclesiastes, 4. Solomon's Song.

On the contrary, Jerome (A. D. 422.) The Talmud, and the later Jews, reckon but eight prophets and nine Hagiographa. Jerome's list is as follows: 1—5. Pentateuch, 6. Joshua, 7. Judges and Ruth, 8. two books of Samuel, 9. two books of Kings, 10. Isaiah, 11. Jeremiah's prophecies and Lamentations, 12. Ezekiel, 13. the twelve minor prophets. Then come the Hagiographa, 14. Job, 15. Psalms, 16. Proverbs, 17. Ecclesiastes, 18. Solomon's Song, 19. Daniel, 20. two books of Chronicles, 21. Ezra and Nehemiah, 22. Esther. In the Talmud (Cent 2—4) we have the same books under the same heads: but they stand in a little different order and are spread into twenty-four. The *earlier prophets*, (who, unfortunately for this method of division, are no prophets at all) are Joshua, Judges, the books of Samuel, and the books of Kings: the *later prophets* are Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the twelve. The Hagiographa are Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah, Chronicles. The Masoretic division, or that of our present Hebrew bibles, is in all important respects the same, differing about as much from the Talmudists, as they from Jerome. There is a diversity in the order of the Hagiographa, and of the larger prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

* The singular circumstance, that Daniel has been put down among the miscellaneous books of the canon, instead of taking his place in the noble company of the prophets, excited long ago a great deal of speculation. The later Jews tell us, it was because he did not utter his prophecies in the holy land: as if the spirit of God was confined within geographical limits, and men were out of the reach of its influences when they wandered from Palestine; as Jonah expected by taking ship for Tarshish to flee from the presence of Jehovah! The opinion of the great Grotius seems hardly more worthy of regard, that Daniel lost his place in the canon on account of his court life; and that as a Persian satrap he was set by the side of David and his royal son. Herder, though he does not distinctly

under the law of Moses; they were its mouth, for the time and occasion before them; they were to be tried according to its directions; and were, more or less, popular leaders in the state, with the fortunes of which they were closely connected. In short, they were the breathing, eloquent spirit of the history that preceded them. All the books which did not fall under these two classes, they that were short, or later known, or later written, were added as an appendix, and in part as a proof and continuation of the foregoing accounts, under the name of holy writings; and we may discover in this a solicitude to let nothing be lost. From this point of view we must proceed, in treating of the diversity of the books, or their arrangement according to time and place.

The Books of Moses begin with ancient narratives; of which the contents and tone, the colouring of description, the occasional abruptness, the alternate use of different names of the Deity,—in short the whole fragmentary connexion show, that Moses did not invent them, or receive them at the hands of Gabriel out of the clouds; but that he gathered them from old traditions or documents, and arranged them together with an exactness, which well becomes the most ancient historian of human affairs. The eleven first chapters are evidently distinct pieces, partly fragments; differing from each other in style as well as in matter; using different names of God; and each having the hue of its own incidents and time. After this (chap. xii.) the history of the fathers seems to grow more connected: still however the jointing and insertions are plain enough to be seen; as is evident from chapters 14. 25. 36. 38, and especially in Jacob's blessing.* Why is this so different from the blessing

express an opinion upon it, appears to imply that Daniel does not stand among his brethren because he was not like them a popular leader: but this is fanciful, and has no better ground to rest upon than the other suppositions. Vossius insists that the cause of this fact was the hostility of the Jews towards a prophet, who pointed so distinctly to Jesus as the Messiah. But this idea is altogether erroneous: for we find but one opinion among the Jews, as to the inspiration of Daniel, and the canonical authority of the book that is called by his name. A very different account of this matter, and one that certainly has a great deal in its favour, may be seen in Eichhorn's "*Einleitung in das alte Testament*," 3ter Band, § 616.

* The fragmentary composition of the book of Genesis is fully established. It is a fact, in which all the learned agree, and indeed must be obvious to every careful, though unlearned reader. Who can fail to see 'the jointing and insertions,' of which Herder speaks? Who can read the history of the creation or of the flood, without perceiving that each is made up of two different accounts? One of the evidences of this fact, however, which he

of Moses on the twelve tribes, when it was clearly before the eyes of that lawgiver when he spoke? Because it was a sacred national piece traditionally handed down, which in the mouth of Moses must necessarily be altered to suit that period and situation of Israel; which time had not made superfluous, but rather confirmed.

alludes to,—the use of different names of the Deity,—it may be necessary to explain. I will give as distinct an account as I am able of this singular discovery, and of the use to which it has been applied.—A book was published at Brussels in 1753, with the title "*Conjectures sur les Mémoires Originaux, dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer la Genèse.*" It was written by John Astruc, a celebrated physician of Languedoc, though his name did not appear in the title-page. He perceived that there was a remarkable variation in the names that were used to designate the Deity. Often for a long space the word *Elohim*, God, was exclusively employed; and then, through as considerable a portion, the word *Jehovah* obtained; generally alone, though sometimes joined with *Elohim*. He observed, too, that this change of the name marked, in a great many instances, distinct subjects and pieces: a new document was evidently introduced with the alternation of this important phrase. He concluded, therefore, that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from two ancient, written documents. He went still further, and attempted a division of the book into two parts on the principle of his hypothesis.—He was followed by Eichhorn, who, adopting his theory, proposed a different arrangement of the materials. Ilgen, upon the same plan, offered another and more artificial disposition of the supposed originals; differing from his predecessors especially in this, that he assumed the existence of two documents distinguished by the name *Elohim*.

Thus much for the fact and the conclusions drawn from it. Of the fact the reader may easily satisfy himself by turning to his bible: for our translators invariably render the Hebrew *Jehovah* LORD; and *Elohim*, when applied to the Deity, GOD.—But what is the utmost that can with certainty be inferred from it? Not, one would think, that there were just two sets of accounts employed in the composition of Genesis; for why might not many writers have used either of these peculiarities of phrase? All that can be confidently said of it is, that it confirms, what the learned had long supposed before, the fragmentary character of the book; and its compilation from written materials. It furnishes one of the means, of which every one would avail himself, who should attempt to resolve the whole into its separate parts: but has no right to be the only principle of such a separation. But after all, who can ever hope to accomplish such a division? or who can think it of importance that it ever should be accomplished? It is certainly a most daring undertaking with writings of such antiquity, having shewn that they are made up of distinct pieces, to point out how many of these pieces there are, and even to which of them every word belongs. The most that we can hope to do is here and there to see where a fragment ends and another begins; and occasionally to extract an entire piece; and to detect in some instances, as in the description of the flood, a mixture of two different accounts. We have only to examine and compare with each other the three systems already mentioned, to be convinced that nothing further can be reasonably expected. The results are different, and the methods of proceeding are dif-

Do not ask me from whom came each of these primitive pieces, or how long, or in what manner, they have been transmitted. These inquiries, if they could lift themselves higher than mere conjecture, could hardly be contained in a letter; and it will be enough for you to the right understanding and feeling of those accounts to regard them as what they are, the voice of the fathers of the remotest ages: something like them all ancient nations possess; but no one that we yet know of has any thing to compare with these, short and echo-like as they are, in point of simplicity, exactness, and historical truth. The description of the creation begins; (chap. 1 to 2. 3) and corresponds so well to the infancy of our race, to its first awaking in the world of God, to its needs respecting the disposal and division of time, labour and rest, and the noblest and simplest ideas and duties of its earthly condition;—it is so well ordered and indivisible a whole, that I can conceive of nothing to surpass in originality and simplicity this

“Achilles’ shield, of living nature full.”

That it is a song, my ear does not tell me; and that it is no scientific cosmogony, but a natural first glance at the universe, men will probably believe now, on the word of the eloquent and venerable author* of “Considerations on the principal truths of re-

ferent. Eichhorn resorts to very frequent interpolations: Ilgen devises the idea of a first and second Elohist: Astruc, at a loss how to trace all to his two great sources, supposes no less than ten “memoirs” beside them: and after all is done, the same passages will sometimes be classed by one under the Elohim, and by another under the Jehovah memoir. This seems to indicate pretty strongly the futility of the whole attempt. But what is more positive on this subject is, that there are other diversities observable in the different parts of Genesis, and those not of style merely but of fact, with which the theory now under examination does not coincide. Parts, which could scarcely be produced by the same writer, are arranged under the same head by each of the learned men just mentioned. To select but one out of several instances:—who can suppose that chap. 26. 34 and 36, 2, 3, are from the same author? And yet they belong to the same Elohim document, according to the classification of Astruc and Eichhorn; and are placed by Ilgen in his first Elohist. The truth appears to be, that there are various indications, in the first book of Moses of a change of authors, beside the one which has been raised into such exclusive importance: and what entitles that to such an importance? Many of the psalms address Elohim throughout; and many address Jehovah with equal exclusiveness. Yet has any one ever imagined from thence, that all the first are from one hand; and that all the others likewise are from one and that a different hand? Certainly not. Why, then, should we apply such a supposition to the fragments of Genesis?

* Jerusalem’s “Betrachtungen, &c.”

ligion;" if they would not believe it on older authority. I cannot agree with the author of "the considerations," that Moses derived this account from Egyptian sources: the ideas and expressions, which seem Egyptian, are common to several nations; and appear to be primeval thoughts and words, which have flowed out among many different people from the same fountain. What should an Egyptian piece do, introducing narratives that are any thing rather than Egyptian? and is it not entirely in the same spirit with those narratives, and the very original of them all?—of the history of Paradise and the Fall I have written in the preceding letter: I repeat that I know nothing more child-like, whether we consider the relation itself, or the tone in which it is told. As for the dress of fable in which it is wrapped, that was thrown over it by the nature of the subject and the genius of the age: the origin of evil in the human condition can scarcely be treated otherwise; cannot, at least, be more usefully treated. It is like a fairy tale of the happy, alas vanished! dream of infancy: and you may wonder at me for believing that, as in the description of the creation are contained the simplest natural philosophy, and system of the world, and origin of man;—so in this is to be found the simplest philosophy respecting the tangled knots of human condition and its most complicated windings.—So it is with the history of the first tribes of men, their modes of life, inventions, excesses, fortunes; not forgetting the beautiful song of Lamech* on the invention of the sword. If you will read, upon this and much that precedes it, the second part of "Oldest Records;"† you will find that many ideas in it are now repeated in different forms by authors, who are in other respects wide asunder; and are confirmed by considerations of various kinds. The same remarks will apply to the history of the flood, which was probably compiled from several traditionary accounts;—to the beautiful symbol of the

* The charms of this "beautiful song" are certainly of a very accommodating kind. The fragment is two verses long, and has had perhaps as many constructions put upon it as it contains words. Some suppose that Lamech had really killed *some* young man for *something*; others understand him as declaring that he had never done any such thing; and others think that the words are mere rhodomontade,—“they will find me apt enough if they give me occasion.” Some hear in them the language of remorse, others of exculpation;—some of conjugal kindness, and others of rough boasting. Some contend that the piece relates to polygamy; and others are sure that it refers to the manufacture of arms. Isaac Delgado says, “this speech of Lamech to his wives is quite unintelligible:” but he immediately after takes courage, and goes on with the true sturdy spirit of a commentator: “Lamech's argument *must have been this*.”

† Aelteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts." Leipz. 1774.

rainbow, to the discovery of wine, to the most ancient of maps, (chapter 10th) and to the tradition of the tower-building, which seems in spirit to lift itself up with the growing height it describes.—Over some of these accounts there lies still a heavy mist of antiquity ; yet it is undeniable, that within a few years, and from the most different minds at once, much excellent illustration has been thrown upon them. Jerusalem's "Considerations" are especially valuable as a leading work. Michaelis in his notes to the first book of Moses has said much well ; but much also, as it seems to me, that is foreign from those compositions and the age of them.

With the history of Abraham you cannot help feeling how the tone becomes nearer and more familiar. He was called from far, to be a pilgrim in a foreign land which was to belong to his posterity, as the friend of the Lord Jehovah ; to stamp the name of that Being upon his race by means of monuments, observances, altars, and still more, through purity of manners, righteousness, and a steadfast faith. As for the manner, in which God conversed with him, and he with God ; how, for example, he besought God on behalf of Sodom, and God showed him the stars, revealed the fortunes of his race, demanded of him his son, &c., nothing approaches the simplicity and nobleness as well of the subject as of the description. It is the same with his conduct towards Lot, Melchisedec, Isaac, Ishmael, Eliezer, the children of Heth : like soft rain on the tender grass, like the dew on roses, distils the artless narration. So goes on the history of his children, Isaac, Jacob, Esau, Joseph and his brethren : the most confidential, domestic, sincere, patriarchal and pastoral history. It is very common for men to prate, that the Hebrews have no historical style, and that the first book of Moses is a special proof of this. Nothing was ever more unintelligible to me than such an assumption. I hold the style of these, and of the simplest parts in the other historical books of the Hebrews, to be the very ideal of history for such times, customs, and people :—nay for the truest, best style of all history. Try once, and tell a child something in an opposite style : indulge, for example, in little conceits, alter circumstances and phrases, and contradict yourself, for the sake of some pretty variety, in what you said a moment before ; or, instead of writing plainly, give into observations and pragmatistical reflexions ;—the child will not attend to you, but will remind you that you before related it thus and thus ; and if he repeats it after you, he will repeat it like the books of Moses, the book of Ruth, the most delightful passages of Samuel and Kings. All the oldest writers of genuine worth relate even so ; Homer and Herodotus, Xenophon

where he does not philosophize, and Livy where he does not interweave speeches: the last, however, speak agreeably to the diversity of their nations and eras. It is enough to show, that where history departs from this simple tone, through philosophy, fictions, impertinent reflexions, and long speeches, it may win in polished periods and rounded ornaments, but it loses the peculiar, the well connected pearls of truth, and comes at last to forfeit the name of history. Nothing in the world is more difficult than this simple style, that we should merely tell what happened, and not what we think, saw or conjecture; as you may easily satisfy yourself of by a single experiment. I do not mean that you should essay that foolish manner, in which some dull wittings have endeavoured to render the chronicle style of the Bible ridiculous: Every language, age and history, has its own peculiar strain of narrative; and you find it so in these books, according to the difference of time and subject. The familiar, domestic style of the patriarchs, becomes, in the history of the march of the Israelites, in that of their heroes and warlike prophets, more solemn and bold; and often, as is very natural, wholly epic: the style should harmonize with the subject, without any obscurity or love of moralizing, so that the history may stand out naturally and alive. And it is in this very respect, I think, that these family pieces are models. Sublime and truly poetical as is much that we find in the language of the Deity, in the actions and blessings of the patriarchs, often in the mere silence and the easy manner of presenting the scene, when the most difficult events come to be recounted;—still nothing is sought, nothing is borrowed or artificial. I know of nothing nobler than the manner, in which God speaks to Abraham, and Abraham obeys; than the visions which he beholds; than his conference with Melchisedec and the King of Sodom. How magnificently wild, on the contrary, is the first adventure of the child Ishmael; and that prophecy of the angel respecting him in the wilderness! how suited to the history and the spot, to the character and destiny of that archer of the woods! Fearfully hurrying is the overthrow of Sodom, silently sublime the offering up of Isaac, sweetly loquacious the wooing of Rebecca; the journeying of Isaac is full of timidity, and there is fragrance in his rural, paternal blessing. How secret and holy, again, is Jacob's vision of the opened heaven, and of the God of his fathers so near him! How bitter-sweet his service with Laban; and how darkly heroic his night conflict with the unknown; and in fine how infinitely versatile the intricate story of Joseph!—Try now the proof; alter any thing in the soft touches, in the apparent negligences and repetitions; clothe these poetical features in the

wooden verses of modern art ; or overload the simplest history in the world, whose whole character depends on this simplicity, with invented beauties ; so that the silence shall break out into speech, and the husbandman shall talk like a warrior, and the poor family scene shall become a rich epic exhibition ; every thing is immediately revolting, and nature and truth are lost. A quietness should pervade the very reading of these books ; a sort of morning stillness ; and a youthful simplicity becomes it the best. It is remarkable how readily children read or hear any thing of such a kind ; and in the same manner do you read and retain these narratives. Luther says of himself, that when he was a monk he could not understand why God would have all this domestic prattle in his bible : but when he became a husband and a father, he learned to understand it, and commented on the first book of Moses almost to the day of his death. Statesmen and mere men of learning, and fastidious corrupted minds, are continually mistaking this book ; and some of them have heaped together a great deal of absurdity about it : I rejoice that you are not among the number. Read this, as well as the other parts of the Bible, rather avoiding learned commentaries, and seeking their aid only in difficult and unintelligible passages. The best commentary is to read, in travels through the East, of the life of the Scenites, their customs and manners ; and from these argue up to those older times of innocence and strength. Jerusalem's "Considerations" and "Letters on Moses," as also Delany's* dissertations upon particular points of this history, are guides to a closer acquaintance with individual passages and situations.

UNITARIAN EXPOSITOR.

No. VI.

WE proceed in this number to the examination of those texts in which the appellation, God, is commonly, and as we think, erroneously, understood to be applied to Christ. Those which stand foremost, as well for their intrinsic difficulty, as for the importance assigned to them by Trinitarians, are found in the introduction of St. John's gospel. We are not sure that the explanation which we think satisfactory will approve itself to those who are not conversant with theological discussions, or that we

* "Revelation examined with candour." Vol. 1.

can make ourselves perfectly intelligible to them upon this much agitated passage. We shall attempt, however to be perspicuous and brief.

In order to understand the meaning of the apostle in these texts, some knowledge is requisite of the philosophical theology, not of the poor who first believed the gospel which was preached unto them, but of those who embraced Christianity at a somewhat later period, who were deeply infected with the pride and the prejudices of a heathen philosophy, and who laboured to assimilate and incorporate into each other, things so very unlike in their nature as Christianity and Platonism, or Gnosticism. It is necessary to know, that there were some who called themselves Christians, and who thought themselves philosophers, who held as a part at once of their religious and philosophical tenets, that there was a class of beings possessed of distinct and separate existence, which were, to use something like their language, *emanations* from the Supreme Being ; and some, who esteeming matter a source of evil alone, and intending to honour their master, denied that he had a body, and asserted that he took upon him merely the semblance of one. They gave the names of *logos*, *light*, *life*, and many such, to individuals of this class of existences, and traced their descent one from another in endless genealogies, which were very probably those which were reprov- ed by St. Paul, and which certainly deserved to be styled "prophane and vain babbling, and oppositions of science falsely so called." Those Christians who held such opinions as we have here mentioned, were called Gnostics ; but there were others, who without going into all the extravagancies of this sect, agreed with them in regarding the Logos as a being distinct from God, and in confounding the character and properties of this being, with the person of Jesus Christ. These were the Platonists.

A knowledge of these facts will serve to explain, and we think this alone will point out, in what manner the apostle was led to that remarkable use of language which is found in the commencement of his gospel ; and when these fantastic notions have become as familiar to us as they were to many of the contemporaries of St. John, we shall probably have little difficulty in perceiving that in this passage, he designed to enforce several plain and simple truths in opposition to doctrines so irrational and injurious. We think he meant to shew,

1. That the divine power manifested by Jesus Christ, was not that of an *æon*, or *emanation* called the *logos*, possessing distinct existence and power from the Supreme Being, but that it was the power of God himself.

2. That, he who was the express image of the glory of the Father, was clothed in flesh, that it was no phantom which had exhibited itself to them under a human form.

3. And thirdly, he intended to imply, that there were in reality no such beings as they had imagined, and to point out in what manner all those names of æons, such as light and life, whose attributes they supposed to be exhibited in Jesus, might be used in reference to him, and applied to him.

"*In the beginning*," he says, "was the *logos*, and the *logos* was with God, and the *logos* was God;" those attributes of the Deity which have been embodied under this title do not constitute a separate being emanating from him, but are and always have been a part of his nature; by the exercise of them was every thing made that has been created, and every thing done which he has accomplished; they are the light and the life of men, and a glorious exhibition of them has been made, which men in the blindness of their hearts have not acknowledged. John was commissioned to bear testimony to this exercise of divine wisdom, power and goodness, which is extended to all men, and which has been displayed in the world, though the world knew it not. "It came to its own;" God first showed forth his mercy to his peculiar people, and they have not acknowledged his hand. "And the *logos* was made flesh;" the Divine goodness was exhibited through the agency of one who possessed human nature, who was clothed with a real body like other men. It was no deception, our eyes have seen the glory of the only begotten and dearly beloved Son of God; our ears have heard the gracious truths which proceeded out of his mouth whilst he dwelt among us. And it is of him that John bore witness, &c.

From this very brief explanation of those parts of the passage with which we are principally concerned, it will be seen that we do not suppose the *logos* to mean Christ, but the Divine attributes which were displayed through him, and consequently that the apostle allows no intermediate existences emanating from God, or supplying the place of a soul to a human body, but claims as the immediate exercises of God's power and goodness, those revelations of truth and acts of mercy which He enabled Jesus Christ to discover and to perform. The explanation seems to us simple and clear; but we are aware that it may at first, appear very differently to others, and we ask them merely to examine more particularly the statements we have made with respect to the notions of the Platonists and Gnostics, and the probability of St. John's writing with reference to those notions. To us the supposition, which the trinitarian must make, seems a most extraordinary one. He must either believe that this obscure language,

which occurs no where else in the New Testament, but which was much in vogue with a numerous and troublesome sect of heretical Christians of that day, was used by St. John without any reference to that sect; or he must imagine, that the Platonists and Gnostics derived their language from that of the Christians.* But we ask, what reason can be given for this very remarkable language, if it was not used in reference to the same terms, which were current among these philosophic Christians. And if it had this reference, we think our case is made out, for we esteem it altogether improbable, if these notions, with respect to the *logos* particularly, were common to all Christians and made an essential part of their creed, that we should find so much more said about it by the philosophers than the apostles; we think it perfectly incredible that three separate narratives of our Saviour's ministry, an account of the preaching of the principal apostles, and numerous letters to the churches they established, should have been written without a syllable escaping from their pens, without a hint dropped even by accident upon these very remarkable subjects. While, on the other hand, as we know from historical evidence, that erroneous ideas with regard to certain intermediate beings between God and man, derived from heathen philosophy, were early incorporated with Christianity, we can perceive no improbability in the supposition, that the apostle who attained the greatest age, and wrote later than either of the others, should have thought it necessary to oppose them. It is in the writings of St. John that we find them explicitly and directly contradicted, and we therefore think it most probable that he *intended* to check their extension.

It is not to be supposed that this passage can be understood without diligent attention; and we are able to furnish our readers only with hints to assist their researches, as we should be obliged to devote too much space to an elaborate defence of these positions. The principal difficulty is to render one's self familiar with those modes of thinking, and forms of expression which were common in the times of the apostle, but which now seem so strange and absurd, that we are almost inclined to doubt whether men ever indulged in such vagaries.

* This is the idea of Bryant with regard to the Platonists. See his work on the *Logos*.

MEMOIR OF JOHN GALLISON, ESQ.

OUR last number contained a brief notice of Mr. Gallison ; but his rare excellence, and the singular affection, esteem and confidence which he enjoyed, have been thought to demand a more particular delineation of his character. And the office is too grateful to be declined. In the present imperfect condition of human nature, when strange and mournful inconsistencies so often mix with and shade the virtues of good men ; when truth, that stern monitor, almost continually forbids us to give free scope to admiration, and compels us to dispense our praise with a measured and timid liberality ; it is delightful to meet an example of high endowments, undebased by the mixture of unworthy habits and feelings ; to meet a character whose blamelessness spares us the pain of making deductions from its virtues. And our satisfaction is greatly increased, when Providence has seen fit to unfold this character in the open light of a conspicuous station, so that many around us have had opportunity to observe it as well as ourselves, and that we can give utterance to our affection and respect, with the confidence of finding sympathy and a full response in the hearts of our readers.

But we have a higher motive, than the relief and gratification of personal feelings, for paying this tribute to Mr. Gallison. We consider his character as singularly instructive, particularly to that important class of the community, young men. His life, whilst it bore strong testimony to those great principles of morality and religion, in which all ranks and ages have an interest, and on which society rests, seems to us peculiarly valuable, as a commentary on the capacities and right application of youth, as demonstrating what a young man may become, what honour, love, and influence he may gather round him ; and how attractive are the christian virtues at that age which is generally considered as least amenable to the laws of religion. For young men we chiefly make this record ; and we do it with a deep conviction, that society cannot be served more effectually than by spreading through this class a purer morality, and a deeper sense of responsibility than are now enforced by public opinion ; for our young men are soon to be the fathers, guides and defenders of the community ; and however examples may now and then occur of early profligacy changed by time into purity and virtue, yet too often the harvest answers to the seed, the building to the foundation ; and perhaps it will appear on that great day which is to unfold the consequences of actions, that even forsaken vice leaves wounds in the mind, which are slowly healed, and which

injure the moral powers and predispose to moral disease through the whole life.

In this connection it may be proper to observe, that there is no country, in which society has such an interest in bringing strong moral and religious influences to bear on young men, as in this ; for our country has been distinguished by the premature growth of those to whom it gives birth. Various circumstances here develop the mind and active powers earlier than in Europe. Our young men come forward sooner into life ; mix sooner in the stir and conflicts of business and politics ; and form sooner the most important domestic relations. It has often been suggested, that the mind suffers under this forcing system, that it is exhausted by excess of action, that a slower growth would give it greater strength and expansion. But be this true or not, (and we trust that the suggestion is founded on remote analogies rather than on observation,) one thing is plain, that in proportion as the young advance rapidly in intellect and activity, there should be a powerful application of moral and religious truths and sanctions to their consciences and hearts. Their whole nature should grow at once. The moral sense, the sense of God, should not slumber, whilst the intellect and the passions are awake, and enlarging themselves with a fearful energy. A conviction of their responsibility to God and society should be deeply wrought into the opening reason, so as to recur through life with the force of instinct. Mr. Gallison was a striking example of the early and harmonious unfolding of the moral and intellectual nature, and in this view his character is particularly fitted to the wants and dangers of our state of society.

When we know or hear of uncommon excellence, it is natural to enquire, by what propitious circumstances it was formed ; and hence the curiosity which has sifted so diligently the early history of eminent men. But such investigations we believe, generally teach us, that character is more independent on outward circumstances than is usually thought, that the chief causes which form a superior mind are within itself. Whilst the Supreme Being encourages liberally the labours of education by connecting with them many good and almost sure results, still, as if to magnify her own power and to teach men humility and dependence, he often produces, with few or no means, a strength of intellect and principle, a grace and dignity of character, which the most anxious human culture cannot confer. In the early years of Mr. Gallison, we find no striking circumstances or incidents which determined the peculiarities of his future character. The processes, by which he became what he was, were inward ; and the only voice, which could disclose them, is now silent in death,

He was born in Marblehead, October, 1788. His mother, a sister of the late Chief Justice Sewall, survived his birth but a few hours ; and his life began with one of the heaviest of life's afflictions, the loss of a mother's love. He was so happy however as to be the object of singular and never failing kindness in his surviving parent, whom he requited with no common filial attachment ; and he may be cited as a proof of the good effects of that more unrestrained and tender intercourse between parents and children, which distinguishes the present from the past age. He was early placed under the tuition of the Rev. Dr. Harris, now President of Columbia College, New York, then preceptor of an academy, and rector of an episcopal church, in Marblehead. He is said to have endeared himself to his revered instructor by his docility, industry, modesty, love of truth, and steady improvement. He held a high but unenvied rank at school ; and it may be mentioned as an evidence of early judgment and a constant mind, that some of the friendships of that early period went with him to the grave, and were among the best enjoyments of his life.

He entered the University at Cambridge, A. D. 1803, in the 15th year of his age ; and whilst his unremitting application gave him the full benefit of its various provisions for literary improvement, his consistent character and social virtues won for him universal confidence and esteem. On leaving the University he commenced the study of the law under the Hon. John Quincy Adams, and having completed his preparation under the Hon. Joseph Story, began the practice of his profession at Marblehead A. D. 1810. By the advice of his friends he soon removed to this metropolis, a more proper, because wider sphere of action. Here he experienced, for a time, those anxieties and depressions, which form the common trial of young men, who enter a crowded profession. But his prospects were brightened by a connection in business, which he formed with the Hon. William Prescott, and which, as it was unsolicited and attended by other flattering circumstances, gave him a gratifying assurance of the confidence which he had inspired. The progress of his reputation as a lawyer was soon a matter of common remark ; and those, who were most capable of understanding the depth and extent of his legal attainments, were confident, that should his life be spared, he would attain the highest honours of his profession.

He died December, 1820, at the age of 32. The shock given to the community by this event was unusual and the calamity was heightened by its unexpectedness. His general health, cheerfulness, and activity had given the promise of a long life, and his friends were not alarmed for him until a week before his

death. His disease was an inflammation of the brain, which first discovered itself in slight aberrations of mind, and terminated in delirium. This awful eclipse of reason continued to the last, so that his friends were denied the satisfaction of receiving from his dying lips assurances of his Christian hope. Some of them however recollect with pleasure, that at the beginning of his disease, when his intellect was rather exalted than deranged, his expressions of religious feeling and joy were unusually strong; and he has left them higher consolation than a dying testimony, even the memory of a blameless and well-spent life.

Having given this brief record of a life too peaceful and prosperous to furnish matter for biography, we proceed to give our views of the character of Mr. Gallison.—His chief distinction was not talent, although he had fine powers of intellect, and a capacity of attention, which, in usefulness if not in splendour, generally surpasses genius. His primary characteristic, and that which gave him his peculiar weight in the community, was the force of moral and religious principle; a force, which operated with the steadiness of a law of nature, a paramount energy which suffered no portion of life or intellect to be wasted, which concentrated all his faculties and feelings on worthy objects. His powers did not astonish, but none of them were lost to himself or society. His great distinction was the singleness of his mind, the sway which duty had gained over him, his habit of submitting to this as to an inviolable ordinance of the universe. Conscience was consulted reverently as an oracle of God. The moral power seemed always at work in his breast, and its control reached to his whole life.

We sometimes witness a strong regard to duty, which confers little grace or interest on the character, because partial and exclusive views are taken of duty, and God is thought to require a narrow service, which chains and contracts instead of unfolding the mind. In Mr. Gallison the sense of duty was as enlightened and enlarged, as it was strong. To live religiously, he did not think himself called to give up the proper pursuits and gratifications of human nature. He believed, that religion was in harmony with intellectual improvement, with the pleasures of imagination and society, and especially with the kind affections. His views of the true excellence of a human being were large and generous; and hence instead of that contracted and repulsive character, which has often been identified with piety, his virtue, though of adamant firmness, was attractive, cheerful, lovely.

This union of strength and light in his sense of duty, gave a singular harmony to his character. All his faculties and sensibilities seemed to unfold together, just as the whole body grows

at once ; and all were preserved by a wise presiding moral sentiment in their just proportions. He was remarkably free from excess, even in the virtues and pursuits to which he was most prone. His well balanced mind was the admiration of his friends. He had strong feeling, yet a calm judgment ; and unwearied activity without restlessness or precipitancy. He had vigour and freedom of thought, but not the slightest propensity to rash and wild speculation. He had professional ardour, but did not sacrifice to his profession the general improvement of his intellect and heart. He loved study, and equally loved society. He had religious sensibility, but a sensibility which never rested, until it had found its true perfection and manifestation in practice. His mind was singularly harmonious, a well adjusted whole ; and this was the secret of the signal confidence which he inspired ; for confidence, or the repose of our minds on another, depends on nothing so much as on the proportion which we observe in his character. Even a good feeling, when carried to excess, though viewed with indulgence and affection, always shakes in a measure our trust.

From this general survey, we pass to some particulars of the character of Mr. Gallison. His religion was a trait which claims our first consideration. He believed in God, and in the revelation of his will by Jesus Christ ; and he was not a man in whom such a belief could lie dead. That great and almost overwhelming doctrine of a God, the Maker of all things, in Whom he lived, and from Whom all his blessings came, wrought in him powerfully. He was not satisfied with a superficial religion, but was particularly interested in those instructions from the pulpit which enjoined a deep, living, all-pervading sense of God's presence and authority, and an intimate union of the mind with its Creator. A friend, who knew him intimately, observes : " In our frequent walks, his conversation so naturally and cheerfully turned on the attributes and dispensations of God, as convinced me that his religion was no less the delight of his heart, than the guide of his life. Though habitually temperate in his feelings, I have sometimes known him kindle into rapture while conversing on these holy themes."

But his religion, though strong and earnest, was in unison with his whole character, calm, inquisitive, rational. Uninfected by bigotry or fanaticism, unseduced by the fair promises of the spirit of innovation, he formed his views of the Christian system with caution, and held them without asperity. In regard to that important doctrine which has lately agitated the community, he was a Unitarian, believing in the pre-existence of the Saviour, and as firmly believing that he was a distinct being from the Supreme God, derived from and dependent on him ; and he considered the

Gospel of John, which is often esteemed as the strong hold of opposite sentiments, as giving peculiar support to these views. We mention this, not because the conclusions of so wise and good a man were necessarily true, but because reproach is often thrown on the opinions which he adopted, as wanting power to purify and save. He may have erred, for he was a man; but who that knew him can doubt that, whatever were his errors, he held the most important and efficacious doctrines of Christianity? His religious friends, and they were not a few, can testify to the seriousness and reverence with which he approached the scriptures, and to the fidelity with which he availed himself of the means of a right interpretation.

His religion was not ostentatiously thrust on notice; but he thought as little of hiding it, as of concealing his social feelings, or his love of knowledge. It was the light by which he walked, and his daily path shewed whence the light came. Of his decision in asserting the principles of that religion, which he received as from God, he gave a striking proof in his address to the Peace Society of this Commonwealth, which breathes the very morality of Christ, and is throughout a mild but firm remonstrance against great practical errors, which have corrupted the church almost as deeply as the world. It was so natural to him to act on the convictions of his mind, that he seemed on this occasion utterly unconscious, that there was a degree of heroism in a young man of a secular calling, and who mixed occasionally in fashionable life, enlisting so earnestly in the service of the most neglected, yet most distinguishing virtues of Christianity.

That a man, to whom Christianity was so authoritative, should be characterized by its chief grace, benevolence, we cannot wonder. Nature formed him for the kind affections, and religious principle added tenderness, steadiness, dignity to the impulses of nature. That great maxim of Christianity, "No man liveth to himself," was engraven on his mind. Without profession, or show, or any striking discoveries of emotion, he felt the claim of every thing human on his sympathy and service. His youth and professional engagements did not absolve him to his own conscience from labouring in the cause of mankind; and his steady zeal redeemed from business sufficient time for doing extensive good. In the institutions with which he connected himself, for useful objects, he gave more than his property; he contributed his mind, his judgment, his well directed zeal; and the object which he was found to favour, derived advantage from his sanction, no less than from his labours.

He felt strongly, what a just view of human nature always teaches, that society is served by nothing so essentially, as by the infusion of a moral and religious spirit into all its classes ; and this principle, like every other, when once recognized, became to him a law. We cannot but mention with great pleasure the earnestness with which he entered into a plan for collecting the poor children in the neighbourhood of the church where he worshipped, into a school for religious instruction on the Lord's day. He visited many poor families on this errand of charity, offering at once Christian instruction and the pecuniary means by which the children might be clothed decently to receive it ; and he gave a part of every Sunday to this office. The friend, whom we formerly quoted, observes, " I was much delighted to see him one Sunday, leading one of his little flock, (who being lately arrived had not become familiarized to his home) through our dirtiest lanes, and inquiring at the humblest sheds for his dwelling." To a man, crowded with business, and accustomed to the most refined society, this lowly and unostentatious mode of charity could only have been recommended by a supreme sense of religious and social obligation. He was one of the few among us, who saw, that the initiation of the poor into moral and religious truth, was an office worthy of the most cultivated understanding, and that to leave it, as it is sometimes left, to those whose zeal outstrips their knowledge, was to expose to hazard and reproach one of the most powerful means of benefitting society.

Another cause to which he devoted himself was the Peace Society of this commonwealth, and to this institution his mind was drawn and bound by perceiving its accordance with the spirit of christianity. Accustomed as he was to believe that every principle which a man adopts is to be carried into life, he was shocked with the repugnance between the christian code and the practice of its professed followers on the subject of war ; and he believed, that christianity, seconded as it is by the progress of society, was a power adequate to the production of a great revolution of opinion on this point, if its plain principles and the plain interests of men were earnestly unfolded. There was one part of this extensive topic, to which his mind particularly turned. He believed, that society had made sufficient advances to warrant the attempt to expunge from the usages of war, the right of capturing private property at sea. He believed that the evils of war would be greatly abridged, and its recurrence checked, were the ocean to be made a safe, privileged, unmolested pathway for all nations, whether in war or peace ; and that the minds of men had become prepared for this change, by

the respect now paid by belligerents to private property on shore, a mitigation of war to be wholly ascribed to the progress of the principles and spirit of christianity. His interest in this subject led him to study the history of maritime warfare, and probably no man among us had acquired a more extensive acquaintance with it. Some of the results he gave in an article in the *North American Review* on Privateering, and in a Memorial to Congress against this remnant of barbarism, which will probably be offered during this session. To this field of labour he certainly was not drawn by the hope of popularity; and though he outstripped the feelings of the community, his efforts will not be vain. He was a pioneer in a path, in which society, if it continue to advance, will certainly follow him, and will at length do justice to the wisdom as well as purity of his design.

Other institutions shared his zeal and countenance, but we pass from these to observe, that his benevolence was not husbanded for public works or great occasions. It entered into the very frame and structure of his mind, so that, wherever he acted, he left its evidences and fruits. Even in those employments, where a man is expected to propose distinctly his own interest, he looked beyond himself; and those who paid him for his services, felt that another debt was due, and personal attachment often sprung from the intercourse of business. In his social and domestic connections, how he felt and lived, and what spirit he breathed, we learn from the countenances and tones of his friends, when they speak of his loss. The kind of praise which a man receives after death corresponds generally with precision to his character. We can often see on the decease of a distinguished individual, that whilst all praise, few feel; that the heart has no burden, no oppression. In the case of Mr. Gallison, there was a general, spontaneous conviction that society had been bereaved; and at the same time, a feeling of personal bereavement, as if a void which no other could fill, were made in every circle in which he familiarly moved; and this can only be explained by the genuine benevolence, the sympathy with every human interest, which formed his character. His benevolence indeed was singularly unalloyed. Those feelings of unkindness which sometimes obscure, for a moment, the goodness of excellent men, seldom or never passed over him. Those who best knew him cannot by an effort of imagination put an acrimonious speech into his lips, any more than they can think of him under an entirely different countenance. The voice ceases to be his, its tones do not belong to him, when they would make it the vehicle of unkindness. We have understood, what we should not doubt,

that in his profession, amidst the collision of rivals, his ambition, which undoubtedly degenerated sometimes into excess, was still so controlled by his generosity and uprightness, that he was never known to sully with an envious breath, the honest fame of another, or to withhold a ready testimony to another's worth. So great was the kindness of his heart, that his many pressing employments did not exclude those little attentions to his kindred, for which multiplied cares are generally admitted as an excuse. He made leisure for minute as well as important services, and thus it is that a feeling of tenderness as well as of respect is spread through the whole circle of his relatives.

In regard to his intellectual powers, they derived their superiority not only from the liberality of nature, but from the conscientiousness with which they were improved. He early felt the importance of a generous and extensive culture of the mind, and systematically connected with professional studies the pursuit of general literature. He was a striking example of the influence of an operative and enlightened moral sense over the intellect. His views were distinguished not so much by boldness and excursiveness as by clearness, steadiness, judiciousness and truth, and these characteristic properties of his understanding derived their strength, if not existence, from that fairness, rectitude, simplicity, and that love of the true and useful, which entered so largely into his moral constitution. The objects on which he thought and wrote did not offer themselves to him in the bright hues of inspired imagination, but in the forms, dimensions, and colours of reality; and yet there was no tameness in his conception, for the moral relations of things, the most sublime of all relations, he traced with eagerness and delighted to unfold. Accordingly in all his writings we perceive the marks of an understanding surrounded by a clear and warm moral atmosphere. His intellect, we repeat it, was excited and developed very much by moral and religious principle. It was not naturally creative, restless, stirred by a bright and burning imagination. The strong power within was conscience, enlightened and exalted by religion; and this sent life through the intellect, and conferred or heightened the qualities by which it was distinguished.

Of his professional character we know nothing by personal observation; but we do know, that in a metropolis, where the standard of professional talent and purity is high, he was eminent. We have understood, that he was at once a scientific and practical lawyer, uniting comprehensive views of jurisprudence, and laborious research into general principles, with a singular accuracy, and most conscientious fidelity, in investigating the details of the causes in which he was engaged. The spontaneous tribute of

the members of the Suffolk bar to so young a brother is perhaps without precedent. It deserves to be mentioned among his claims to esteem, that he was not usurped by a profession to which he was so devoted; that his thirst for legal knowledge and distinction, though so ardent, left him free for such variety of exertions and acquisitions.

Of his industry, we have had occasion frequently to speak, and it was not the least striking trait in his character. We need no other proof of this, than his early eminence in a profession, which offers no prizes to genius unaccompanied by application, whose treasures are locked up in books, which hold out no lures to imagination or taste, and which can only interest a mind disposed to patient and intense exertion. We recur, however, to his industry, not so much because it distinguished him, as from the desire of removing what seems to us a false impression, that he fell a victim to excessive application. That he was occasionally guilty of intemperate study, (a crime in the eye of a refined morality, because it sacrifices future and extensive usefulness to immediate acquisition,) is probably true; but less guilty, we apprehend, than many who are not charged with excess. His social nature, his love of general literature, and his regular use of exercise, gave as great and frequent relaxation to his mind, as studious men generally think necessary; nor ought his example to lose its power, by the apprehension, that to follow his steps will be to descend with him to an early grave.

This excellent man, it has pleased God to take from us; and to take without warning, when our hope was firmest, and his prospects of usefulness and prosperity were to human eye, unclouded. That such a course should be so short, is the general sorrow. But ought we to think it short? In the best sense his life was long. To be the centre of so many influences; to awaken through so large a circle sentiments of affection and esteem; to bear effectual testimony to the reality of religion; to exalt the standard of youthful character; to adorn a profession, to which the administration of public justice, and the care of our civil institutions are peculiarly confided; to uphold and strengthen useful associations; to be the friend of the poor and ignorant, and a model for the rich and improved; to live in the hearts of friends, and to die amidst general, deep, unaffected lamentation; these surely are not evidences of a brief existence. *Honourable age is not that, which standeth in length of time, nor which is measured by number of years; but wisdom is the grey hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age.*

Still the question may be asked, "why was he taken from so much usefulness?" Were that state laid open to us, into which

he is removed, we should have an answer. We should see, that this world is not the only one, where intellect is unfolded, and the heart and active powers find objects. We might see, that such a spirit, as his, was needed now in another and nobler province of the creation; and that all God's providence towards him had been training and fitting him to be born, if we may so speak, at this very time, into the future world, there to perform offices and receive blessings which only a mind so framed and gifted could sustain and enjoy. *He is not lost.* Jesus, whom he followed, "hath abolished death." Thought, affection, piety, usefulness do not die. If they did, we should do well to hang his tomb with sackcloth, or rather to obliterate every trace and recollection of his tomb and his name, for then a light, more precious than the sun's, is quenched forever. But he is not lost, nor is he exiled from his true happiness. An enlightened, just and good mind, is a citizen of the universe, and has faculties and affections which correspond to all God's works. Why would we limit it to earth, perhaps the lowest world in this immense creation? Why shall not the spirit, which has given proof of its divine origin and heavenly tendency, be suffered to rise to its proper abode, to a holier community, to a vision of God, under which earthly and mortal natures would sink and be dissolved.

One benefit of the early removal of such a man as Mr. Gallison is obvious. We learn from it, how early in life the great work of life may begin, and how successfully be prosecuted. Had he lived to advanced years, the acquisitions of his youth would have been forgotten and lost in those of riper years. His character would have been an invaluable legacy, but chiefly to the mature and aged. And surely if his early death shall exalt the aims and purposes of the young; if piety, now postponed to later years, to a winter which bears no such fruit, shall be esteemed the ornament and defence of that interesting and tempted age; if our young men shall learn from him that they belong to God and society; then his early death may prove as useful as a protracted life.

We shall add but one more remark. The general sorrow which followed Mr. Gallison to the tomb, was not only honourable to him, but to the community. For he had no dazzling qualities. His manners were not imposing, nor was he aided by uncommon patronage. His worth was unobtrusive, mild, retiring, and left to win its own way to notice and honour. Yet how few young men have reared such a monument in the memories and hearts of the community? Amidst charges of degeneracy, and with real grounds of humiliation, we should deem

it a privilege to live in a state of society, in which such a character as Mr. Gallison's is so generally understood, and is recompensed with such heartfelt and generous praise.

Note.—A Memoir of Mr. Gallison would be imperfect, which did not contain the tribute of the members of the Suffolk Bar to his worth, and we therefore add it.

On the 26th instant, the Bar of the county of Suffolk, at a meeting holden to consider what measures had become proper in consequence of his decease, unanimously passed the following votes—

Voted, That the members of the Bar will attend the funeral of Mr. Gallison, and that crape be worn by the members, until the end of the present term of the Supreme Court.

Voted, That the following notice of Mr. Gallison's decease be recorded in the books of the Bar.

"The members of our association have been assembled by their common sorrow and sympathy, occasioned by the bereavement which the profession and the community have sustained in the decease of Mr. Gallison.

"As a fraternity our strength is impaired;—as members of society, we are sorrowers in common with all who respect learning, integrity, fidelity, piety, and whatsoever tends to adorn and elevate the fellowship of men.

"The emanations from Mr. Gallison's mind and heart were so familiar to us and of such daily experience, that like some of the most common, though most precious of blessings, it is only by unexpected and irretrievable loss that their just value is perceived.

"Professional learning, in Mr. Gallison, was scarcely a subject of remark. We all felt that he must be learned, for we all knew that he severely exacted of himself to be competent to whatsoever he undertook;—diligence and fidelity were his peculiar qualities; his moral sense made them so;—he could never inspire a confidence that he could not fully satisfy.

"It is not only a learned, a diligent, a faithful minister of justice, that is lost to us; the public have lost one of the purest and most indefatigable and most capable of all men who have attempted to illustrate the utility of professional learning; to prove the beauty and fitness of morality, and to give new attraction to the truth of revealed sanctions. It was among the favorite pursuits and objects of our deceased brother, to trace the connexion and dependence which exist between learning, religion, morality, civil freedom, and human happiness.

"The very virtues which we admired are the cause of our present regret. His labours were incessant—and through these his course is terminated at an early age. However brief, his life has been long enough to furnish a valuable commentary on our professional, moral, and political institutions. He lived long enough to prove that an unaided individual, of such qualities as those which we are called on to regret, will find a just place in the community. He has proved that an unassuming citizen of chastened temper, amiable deportment, indefatigable industry, incorruptible integrity, and sincere attachment to the public welfare, will always be felt, known, and honoured. He has proved that a man who was never known among his contemporaries, associates, and rivals to have refused to others what belonged to them; or to have assumed to himself what was not his own, cannot go down to the tomb unattended by general and heartfelt regret."

A copy of the records.

W. J. SPOONER, *Sec'y.*

[The following remarks upon the rights and duties of government in relation to religion were written during the debates on that subject in the Convention, and were originally intended for the newspaper. Although these debates are now closed, yet as the general principles by which it ought to be settled, are at all times of deep importance, what is here said, it is thought, may not be wholly uninteresting to the readers of the Disciple.]

REMARKS ON THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF GOVERNMENT TO
PROVIDE FOR THE SUPPORT OF RELIGION BY LAW.

THE enquiry into the right of governments to support religion by law, will probably be found to resolve itself entirely into a question of expediency. As, however, in the recent discussions of this subject, in application to the third article of the Massachusetts Bill of Rights, two great questions have been made;—*first*, has civil government a right to provide by law for the support of religion? and *secondly*, is it expedient to exercise this right?—in the remarks I am now to offer, I shall follow the same distribution.

First. As to the right of government. It is objected in the first place, that religion is a matter entirely between every man and his creator, and, of course, that civil authority can have no concern with it. This objection arises from a misapprehension of the distinction between those objects, which are the proper concern of government, and those which are not. Society is not a being, which can think and feel; but a relation of individuals, and is affected only as individuals are affected. Obvious as this truth is, a practical inattention to it has been the cause of many mistakes in political reasoning. It cannot, therefore, be the difference of public and private, that makes the distinction in this case, but it is created by considerations of practicability, expediency and justice. There are many subjects, which government cannot regulate, and there are others, where its interference would, on the whole, be prejudicial, or violate the essential principles of equity; but wherever the control of government is at once possible, useful and just, that control may be properly exerted. Surely the province of government is not merely to provide directly for the security of the persons and property of the citizens; its proper sphere is whatever can promote the peace and happiness of society, in the widest view of the subject. Why else does it encourage institutions for education, for the diffusion of knowledge, the suppression of vice, and the advancement of good morals? It is true, there are various means of promoting important ends, with which it does not intermeddle; not on account of any thing in the abstract nature of these ends,

which renders them improper objects of legislation ; but because legislation cannot reach them or its interference would be productive of more mischief than advantage. Such are those charities and duties, which belong to the intimate relations of life. These are not made the subjects of law, because they are either affections which laws cannot command, or offices so indeterminate that laws cannot define them before hand ; and more especially from the vexatious character of all attempts at such particular regulation. Could laws make good husbands and wives, good parents and children, good neighbours and friends, would it not be the duty of legislatures to enact them ? Could they, in short, inspire the breast of every citizen with the very spirit of true religion, with those principles of obedience to the commands of God, of submission to his will and trust in his promises, which are the only sure foundations of present peace and immortal hopes, how pitiful, as well as unnecessary, would a great portion of that mass of provisions, which now crowds our statute books, become ? But what legislatures, for the reasons mentioned, cannot do directly, they can and ought indirectly to attempt ; and in no way can they so effectually accomplish this, as by securing the diffusion of religious instruction.

But it is not merely from this enlarged view of the objects of government, that its right to support religion results ; religion is also absolutely necessary to the attainment of those ends, which are universally acknowledged to fall within its legitimate province ; the preservation of social order and its own permanency.

It is not upon the sanctions of civil law, that the rights of person and property, that faith in promises, that the mutual reliance and sense of security, which enter into all the transactions and intercourse of social life, and bind the members of a community together, principally depend. Take away the silent and private influences of religion and conscience, which come in upon a man in his retirement, and break off his schemes of fraud, of injustice, and treachery, and the arm of law could place but a feeble check upon human selfishness. Or rather, crimes are guarded against, not so much by those fears, which hold back the villain from perpetrating what he has conceived, as by the production of those moral habits and feelings, which prevent the very formation of guilty designs. Nor can it be too deeply realized, of what vital importance is the operation of religious principle to the very existence of political freedom ; because, where the people are generally corrupt, nothing but a system of minute inspection, of universal regulation and re-

straint, utterly irreconcilable with the spirit of freedom, can save the state from the most thorough licentiousness and anarchy.*

Has not government a right to provide for its own permanency and the integrity of its agents? And without religion where would be the security of oaths, where the incorruptibleness and fidelity of officers, which are the foundation of all civil institutions and rights? It is not merely the religious principles of rulers themselves, by which they are guided and restrained. A magistrate without religion is kept in awe; those sentiments of honour and reputation, which are sometimes a sort of substitute for conscience, are preserved in vigour and activity by the atmosphere of moral purity, created by a religious community. This is true of all governments, and it is especially true of a government like ours, which has its basis in the popular

* For a clear and forcible developement of this topic, the social character of religion, I beg leave to refer to the sermon of the Rev. Dr. Channing on this subject, recently published; where the reader will find some views of government not commonly to be met with. A sermon, of which it is praise enough to say, it is what would be expected from its author. No apology is necessary for subjoining the following extract:

"Few men suspect, perhaps no man comprehends, the extent of the support given by religion to every virtue. No man perhaps is aware, how much our moral and social sentiments are fed from this fountain; how powerless conscience would become without the belief of a God; how palsied would be human benevolence, were there not the sense of a higher benevolence to quicken and sustain it; how suddenly the whole social fabric would quake, and with what a fearful crash it would sink into hopeless ruins, were the ideas of a Supreme Being, of accountableness, and of a future life, to be utterly erased from every mind. Once let men thoroughly believe that they are the work and sport of chance; that no superior intelligence concerns itself with human affairs; that all their improvements perish forever at death; that the weak have no guardian, and the injured no avenger; that there is no recompense for sacrifices to uprightness and the public good; that an oath is unheard in Heaven; that secret crimes have no witness but the perpetrator; that human existence has no purpose, and human virtue no unfailing friend; that this brief life is every thing to us, and death is total, everlasting extinction; once let men *thoroughly* abandon religion, and who can conceive or describe the extent of the desolation which would follow? We hope perhaps that human laws and natural sympathy would hold society together. As reasonably might we believe, that were the sun quenched in the heavens, *our* torches could illuminate, and *our* fires quicken and fertilize the creation. What is there in human nature to awaken respect and tenderness, if man is the unprotected insect of a day? and what is he more, if atheism be true? Erase all thought and fear of God from a community, and selfishness and sensuality would absorb the whole man. Appetite knowing no restraint, and poverty and suffering having no solace or hope, would trample in scorn on the restraints of human laws. Virtue, duty, principle, would be mocked and spurned as unmeaning sounds. A sordid self interest would supplant every other feeling, and man would become in fact, what the theory of atheism declares him to be, a companion for brutes."

will. If there be any force in what has been said, those who deny to government the right to support religion by law, cannot do it on the general and abstract ground. It must then be, because it is supposed to imply in it the right of enforcing error, or involve the violation of the private rights of conscience.

The second objection, then, to the existence of this right in government is, that it implies the right of enforcing error. To every christian it might be a sufficient answer to this objection to say, that our constitution does not require instruction in any particular form of christianity, but only in christianity itself. I am aware, however, it may be said, that although it does not do this directly, yet it authorizes particular societies to do it by giving them the power to raise taxes for that purpose. But the principle of this objection, if admitted any farther than as a circumstance of expediency to be considered, would put an end to all instruction whatever. Shall no professor of a college or master of a school require the attention of his pupils to one word of moral or religious doctrine, because he may be found teaching error instead of truth? May no parent gather his offspring around him, and instil into their tender minds some notions of God, of duty, and of responsibility; must he leave them to grow up without any bias in favour of religion, or one thought of a judgment to come, because it is possible, nay in many cases certain, that pernicious errors may be imbibed in the lessons they receive? The adoption of this principle would shut up every book, that did not claim to be infallible, would close the mouth of every teacher, who did know that he was right.

Does then, in the third place, the supposition of this right in government involve the violation of the private rights of conscience?

The rights of conscience may be supposed to have relation either to opinions, to the expression of opinions, or to actions.

1. Of opinions. We readily admit government has no right to command or forbid the exercise of certain opinions, nor is this peculiar to religious opinions, but is common to all: and for this plain reason, that the enactments of law cannot reach opinions; and while they hold out inducements to prevarication and insincerity, belief can neither be enforced nor changed by the sanctions of civil authority. Yet there are cases of expediency, in which particular religious opinions may very justly be considered as a disqualification for office. Thus, it would have been no violation of the rights of conscience in the first princes of the house of Hanover, during the contests with the Pretender, to have required of every candidate for an important office, either in the state or the army, an abjuration of the supremacy of the Pope.

2dly. What are the rights of government in regard to the public expression and dissemination of doctrines in religion. Here, too, we admit that it is rarely expedient, and of consequence rarely right, for government to interfere. Not that such interference, although by producing a powerful reaction, it may sometimes serve to extend, instead of checking the obnoxious opinions, would generally be ineffectual; but because the truth is most successfully discovered and propagated by an honest and free avowal of sentiments, and an independent and unrestrained discussion of opposite arguments; while such discussions are conducted with moderation and decency. This principle, however, is not without its limitations. Doctrines have been taught and may again be taught, as the precepts of religion, which strike at the very foundations of social order. Thus, when the Catholics inculcated upon their hearers, that no allegiance was due to a protestant ruler, and that even to assassinate such a one was doing God service, it cannot be doubted that such preaching might not only be forbidden but punished by the civil power, however sincerely the plea of conscience might be urged in justification.

3dly. In regard to actions, the sphere of government is more extensive. If any one should maintain, that government has no right to prohibit and punish actions, which are prompted by a sincere conscience, or even in some cases to require those which the conscience of the individual may forbid—let him well consider to what consequences, such a principle might sometimes lead. When the fanatical guides of the mob at Munster led their followers to such enormities of indecency and extravagance, had the civil arm no right to interfere? And when Ravallac raised his hand against the life of Henry IV. of France;—when the Catholics of the Netherlands were taught, that the assassination of the Prince of Orange, the gallant defender of the cause of protestantism and liberty, would be a deed most acceptable in the sight of God, and the solemn duty of every Papist; had the civil arm no right to interfere? When many of the deluded followers of George Fox went naked through the streets, and into the assembled religious congregations of several of the principal cities of England, for a sign to the people; some of them at least were undoubtedly actuated by motives the most conscientious—and had the civil arm no right to interfere?—Nay, more; this very plea of conscience would destroy itself. The bloodiest persecutors, and many of them no doubt with sincerity, have professed the commands of conscience, no less than their victims. If conscience called the martyr to the stake, it was conscience also that bound him to it and lighted the faggots, which were to consume

him. It was the conscience no less than the cruelty of Philip II. which filled the prisons of the inquisition and kindled the fires of the auto da-fe. Even the Apostle of the Gentiles thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

But it may be objected, Has not a man a right to act in obedience to the dictates of his conscience? Undoubtedly, he has not only a right, but it is his duty so to do. Conscience may be erroneous, but it is our only guide, and we are bound to follow it. Can then opposite rights exist; can I have a right to act in a certain way, and at the same time government a right to punish me for it? Not in the abstract nature of things; but in relation to human agents, with limited intelligence, it cannot be otherwise. If you think it your duty to take the life of your neighbour, without the forms of law, you are bound to do it; and it is the no less solemn duty of the law, to hang you for it; or should you be acquitted, it would not be on the ground of conscience, but of insanity. The guilt is in a vincible error—nay, this same conscience itself, sincere as it may be, is often founded on the habitual indulgence of the very vilest passions of our nature. What then is the conclusion? That even in matters of conscience, government must possess the abstract right to interpose its authority; and that the practical right of actual interposition depends not on the scrupulosity, or sincerity of the conscience of the subject; but on the nature and circumstances of the case, or in other words, on expediency. I am aware, that in these remarks upon the general rights of conscience, I shall seem to many to have been labouring to prove some of the plainest and most acknowledged principles of civil polity; and I have been thus particular, not because they appear to me to be necessarily connected with the question in debate, for I am unable to perceive that any provision of the third article of the bill of rights can be considered a violation of a conscience the most scrupulous; but because they have been so often introduced in the discussion.

Do you believe in any religion? If you do not, conscience has nothing to do with the subject; if you do, do you conceive your religion to be of any importance to society? If so, you must think it, in the same proportion, important that a knowledge of it should be diffused; and of consequence that is your duty, in proportion to your means, to aid in this diffusion. Or, will you say that this is a duty of religion, and therefore government has no right to interpose additional sanctions to those of the Divine law. But are you not aware, that the principle of this argument would bear equally against all human means; that it denies the right of gov-

ernment to forbid or to command a single act, that is forbidden or commanded by the law of God? The law of God has said, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not kill : has civil law then no right to punish theft or murder? Perhaps you will say, this is true only in relation to those acts, which are peculiarly of a religious nature. Is it wrong then for government to punish profaneness or blasphemy, because it is written, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain?

But the bill of rights may in its operation require you to assist in the support of a form of religion, in which you do not believe; nay, more, which you may think positively pernicious. It would here perhaps be enough to answer, that this is by no means a necessary or a frequent case, that it is only one of those accidental evils, which must sometimes follow from the operation of the most wholesome general rules; but we are willing to meet the objection in its full force. When, therefore, you say, *positively pernicious*, you probably mean in comparison with the religion which you believe to be the true: since you will not, it is thought, deny, that any religion, which recognizes the great doctrine of retribution, and teaches a correct system of morals, is better than absolute atheism. Did the establishment of the legal teacher take from you the liberty of propagating your own opinions in the parish, there would be something in the objection. But you may labour by every means in your power, both by yourself and the preachers of your sect, to make proselytes of those around you, and should you succeed in gaining a majority, you become entitled to all the privileges of the prevailing party. You are not, therefore, required to aid in the support of a positive evil, but only of an inferior good; nor does even this preclude you from adopting every proper means, which you could otherwise use, for substituting what you believe to be the truth in the place of delusion. Let me ask any conscientious opposer of the principles I am supporting, should an estate in some Catholic country be devised to you, encumbered with the regular tithes to the catholic bishop, or an annuity to a convent, would you on this account hesitate to accept it? Yet were this same devise accompanied with a condition, that you should profess the religion of the Pope, you would undoubtedly reject the gift. What then is the difference, but that in the latter case there is a direct violation of conscience required, while in the former there is none. If, then, under such circumstances, it would be no violation of conscience to pay the tithes or the annuity, when called upon by the law of the land; how can it be a violation of conscience, to require you to contribute your proportion to the support of a form of religion, differing far less materially from your own.

You probably admit it to be the legitimate province of government to secure to every religious assembly the peaceable worship of God in their own way; and is not this an ordinance of government for the support of religion? and may it not impose restraints upon some as burthensome and as directly conducive to what they may conceive the advancement of error, as the requisition made in the former case of you? Consider the suspension of the occupations and labours of busy life upon the sabbath. This is absolutely necessary, that christians may peaceably worship God on that day; yet might not the Jew urge every argument against it, which you can bring forward in the present case? You may say the bill of rights gives facilities for the propagating of the orthodox or the unitarian heresy, and takes from you the dollar, which you have earned. The Jew may say the Christian sabbath gives facilities for spreading the Christian heresy, and takes from him the opportunity of acquiring the dollar, he might otherwise have earned. The establishment of public schools by law is as truly a violation of conscience as the bill of rights; unless there were appended to every such law a positive prohibition, that any master of such school should either pray with his pupils, or give them any instruction touching religion.

I shall now make some remarks upon the second question, the only one, as it seems to me upon which a reasonable doubt can be entertained. Is it then to be expected that religion will be more widely disseminated and better taught, when supported by government, than if left to the voluntary contributions of the citizens?

A strong presumption in favour of the affirmative of this question arises from the universal practice of governments in this respect. Statesmen of all ages have considered the influence of the motives of religion essential to the support of civil laws, and that civil laws were no less necessary to the support of the influence of religion. So remarkable is this universality, that Bishop Warburton, as is well known, considers it a sufficient evidence of the divine legation of Moses, that he did not avail himself of the sanctions of a future state, to give authority to the Jewish ritual and law.

But here will be urged the old objection, the corruptions of religion, the persecutions, and the tyranny that have so generally attended the union of church and state. As well might we argue that because most of the governments of the old world have been oppressive, therefore government itself is an evil and to be abolished. To show the utter inapplicability of the objection, let us consider for a moment in what this union has consisted, and whence its evils have arisen. Take, for illustration,

the establishment of the English church, the purest, perhaps, which has been formed. It has a clergy consisting of different ranks, the higher orders of which are possessed of great wealth and power, and in a great degree dependent on the government not merely for support, but for their appointment and rise in the church; and all this patronage is confined to a single sect, guarded by creeds and subscriptions. What are the consequences? That freedom of inquiry is greatly restricted; that the valuable livings of the church are often made either the consideration or the reward of political subserviency, and the whole weight of clerical influence and ambition brought to aid the measures of the ministry.

I would be understood to speak here, not of the necessary, but the natural consequences. To these consequences there have been and are many noble exceptions. Now let me put it to any man's conscience, to say if either of these tendencies is to be found in the provisions of the Bill of Rights. So far from giving to any one sect the preponderance over another, it is expressly declared that no such preponderance ever shall be given. In freedom of inquiry and judgment, neither the minister nor his people are under any other restraint than that which arises from their mutual influence and from general opinion. Neither the legislature nor the executive have at their disposal the meanest parish in the commonwealth. They cannot deprive a single minister, increase his salary, or advance him to a higher station in the church. For every thing he is dependent on his parish. They elect him to his office, fix the measure of his support, and, when they please, will dismiss him from both. Under such circumstances, even were our executive a monarch and a portion of our legislature an hereditary aristocracy, there could be nothing to fear. But when it is further recollected, that the whole body of the government proceed annually from the bosom of the people, and by the free votes of the people, he, who talks of the dangerous union of church and state, must be either himself deluded by a name, or seek to impose that delusion on others.

Again, an argument against the necessity of the aid of government in the support of religion, is drawn from the history of the dissenters in England, and of several sects in our own country, and from the practice of some of the larger towns in the commonwealth. These facts may be readily admitted, and as easily explained.

As to dissenters, two general observations may be made. In the first place it may be remarked, that those who vary from the prevalent form of religion, still feel all the influence of the

sentiments and habits which are created by that form. In such circumstances, the relation of the establishment to dissent, is precisely the same with that of christianity to deism, and as well might you reason from the decent morals of many deists in christian countries, against the uses of christianity, as from the conduct of dissenters, where an establishment exists, against the necessity of such an establishment. I use this comparison merely as an illustration, without the slightest intention of exciting odium toward any class of christians. Besides, in our own commonwealth the dissenter well knows, that what he does voluntarily, he might otherwise be compelled to do by law.

In the second place, there is always a presumption, that such as depart from the common usage of those around them, have thought more of the subject, and feel a deeper zeal, than many, whom they leave behind. The great mass of those, who have no strong interest in religion of any form, naturally fall into the ranks of the establishment, and it is for such that an establishment is peculiarly necessary; while the very act of dissent implies a more lively engagedness, and calls for a display of more devotion to the cause, and the zeal of the partizan is added to that of the christian.

In several of the most populous of our towns, public instruction in religion is supported by assessments on the pews; and as no one is required to become a pew-holder, this practice is represented as affording a strong presumption, that voluntary contributions would, throughout the State, be completely adequate for this purpose. To this presumption there are two answers. In the first place, the utility of the practice may reasonably be doubted, even in the places referred to; and in the second we cannot reason from what is expedient in towns crowded with inhabitants, to the scattered population of the country.

My first objection to this practice is, that it distributes the burthen of supporting religious instruction very unequally. The amount of the assessment in any case depends, not upon the ability of the pew-holder, but on the situation of his pew; nor is the difference between the pews paying the highest and lowest assessment by any means proportionate to the wealth of those who occupy them. The necessary consequence is, that while by the rich, the pew-tax is scarcely felt, to many, even of the middling classes, it is a burthen they can ill sustain; and not a few very respectable citizens, who might afford to hire and even to own a pew, cannot afford to pay the tax upon it. Were the advantages derived from the institutions of religion merely personal, there might be some justice in this; but they are of a public nature; and in the general security they give to property,

are even more important, than the establishment of laws and magistrates. But the evil does not stop here. Is it not to be feared that many masters of families in Boston, for instance, who think they cannot afford to pay the pew-tax in our congregational societies, and who are too proud to take their seat in the common galleries, either absent themselves from the public services, or go where they can find a cheaper religion? Look into our principal houses of worship; where is that well dressed assemblage of the poorer mechanics, labourers and apprentices, who usually appear in the galleries of country churches? They would willingly pay a small tax; and were they, in consequence of such tax, warned to parish meetings, called upon to vote in the settlement of ministers, erection of meeting houses, &c. would they not feel themselves to be members of a religious community, and instead of wasting their sabbaths in idleness or in low dissipation, be found decent worshippers in the temples of God. These views might be pursued much farther, and it is a subject which demands more consideration, than it has yet received.

But if the evils I have stated are all imaginary, or more than balanced by opposite advantages, still it seems to me, that no argument can be drawn from this usage of the towns to what would be expedient in the country. Were two thirds of the whole population of Boston to withdraw their aid from the support of public worship, public worship would still be supported and respectably supported. But it is not so in a large proportion of parishes in the country. In very many of these latter, from the extent of territory which a parish must necessarily comprehend, the loss of a very few members would destroy the society, or, at least render the support of a minister extremely difficult to those who should remain. Proofs of this, even under the operation of the present system, are within the knowledge of every one. It is believed that in Massachusetts the proportion of ministers to the number of inhabitants in the country will be found considerably to exceed the same proportion in the metropolis; but that in those states, where religion has not been supported by law, this proportion will be found reversed. How is this to be explained but upon the principle just mentioned? The history of dissenters, and the practice of our large towns, therefore, afford a presumption rather in favour of the support of religion by law, than against it.

It becomes those, who would tear away the existing foundations of our religious institutions, to consider well what they will place in their stead. Where are we to look for the motives, which are to induce those voluntary contributions, which are to

be substituted for the requisitions of law? Is it to the sentiments and habits of the people? But these, it is to be feared, will gradually cease with the causes that produced them. Is it to the convictions of duty, and a sense of the vast importance of religion? But that is a dangerous experiment, which places an imagined interest in opposition to duty; and will the support of religion be generally believed more essential to the well being of society, than the erection of public buildings, the maintaining of roads, the support of schools, and finally even of civil government itself? And yet, who would think of leaving these objects to the chance of voluntary contribution? Or is it to pride, to an apprehension of the charge of meanness? But a pretext will never be wanting to justify the individual, at least to himself.—He does not like the preacher, or he has received from him some affront, or he has been left out of some committee in which he should have been included, or he has not in some way or another had that influence in the parish, which his standing demanded. It is true the motives of principle or decency enumerated, will operate, and permanently operate, with very many, perhaps a majority; and this will be sufficient in the large towns, but not so in the country. There, for the reasons already given, the loss of a few will destroy the parish.

It is an important feature of the present system, that it assumes every member of the community, as belonging to some parish, while it is only by a positive act of his own that this connexion can be annulled. Men, like material bodies, have a tendency to continue as they are, and will hesitate to undo what they never would have done. Strangers are continually coming to reside within the precincts of different parishes, young men are coming forward into life. Many in each of these classes might, from various causes, delay attaching themselves to the religious society, till they began to doubt whether it were necessary to do it at all; especially would this be the case, should they see others around them in the same situation, to countenance this neglect.

The simple fact, that a man is called upon to pay for the support of the minister of the parish, is itself, it is believed, no inconsiderable inducement to attend on his ministrations. Men love to have their money's worth, and it has been used as an argument against the establishment of a school fund, that it would diminish the interest of the people in their schools. The argument is not without its weight, and is equally applicable to the subject under consideration. Let it not be said, that one who is led to the house of God by so low a motive, might as well have remained at home. From whatever principle he may attend in the sanctuary, he will, at least, be in the way of good

impressions; and if he be not made better, he may be prevented from growing worse. He will carry with him his wife and children, and will set a beneficial example to those around him. The advantage of the weekly services of public worship are not to be estimated solely by the positive amount of sincere piety, of which they are in the hand of God the means; but also by the evil they prevent. The weekly summons to lay aside the business, the pleasures, and the passions of the world, the regularly repeated enunciations of the rules of moral duty, and the great doctrines of the presence of God, and the sanctions of a future retribution, keep alive something like conscience even in the most obdurate heart, and prevent the decaying sparks of serious sentiment from utterly going out. The vast influence of these causes can only be appreciated by observing the downward progress, that is insensibly made in new settlements, where the sound of the church-going bell is never heard, and the returning sabbath calls to no appropriate services.

Much has been said of the ill-blood and heart-burnings, to which the present system has given rise. But were it executed uniformly and uprightly, would not its tendency be rather to prevent than to occasion such effects? The connection of a minister and his people has been often compared to the marriage relation; and has not the common argument against divorce, that the difficulty of separation prevents the desire of it, a pertinent application to the present case? The habitual feeling, that the tax must be paid, produces a ready acquiescence in it. In proof of this, it is well known that there are many towns in the commonwealth, where, in consequence of the original division of the parishes, a considerable portion of the citizens vote in one parish and worship in another; and this without any contentions or considerable difficulties. But grant the liberty of transferring the tax at pleasure, and preaching will be literally an article in the market, and men will chaffer for it at the cheapest rate. It would give to a few wealthy individuals the entire control in every parish, and have a most degrading tendency to destroy the independence and fidelity of the clergy. Is it not a fact, that very many of the law-suits and animosities which have existed, have arisen from the facilities, afforded by those very persons who most loudly lament these effects, to the practice of "signing off," as it is called; and that, too, where there was scarce a pretence of a change of opinions, and where little or nothing has been actually paid to that parish, to which the relation of the individual was professedly transferred? By the mention of this fact it is by no means my intention to intimate a wish, that the liberty, now granted by the constitution in this respect, should

be taken away. The evil alluded to is probably the inseparable concomitant of a greater good. But I do mean to say, that there are not a few Baptists and Episcopalians among us, who, but for this liberty, would have remained contented and determined Congregationalists all their days; and I advert to the circumstance merely as an illustration of the principle stated above.—It will be perceived, that in these last remarks, principal reference is had to the public advantages of religion, and to that method of supporting it, which is most conducive to this end. So far as the individual is concerned, he is, and ought to be, left at perfect liberty to attend on those ministrations, which are most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience.

But after all, it is to experience we are to look for the most interesting instruction on this subject. What then are the lessons of experience. For forty years, we might rather say, for two centuries, has this system been in operation in our own Commonwealth. And where, let me ask, has freedom of inquiry been less restricted, where has persecution or oppression been less felt; where are the institutions of religion more respected, the sabbath better observed, where is sincere piety more prevalent, or the christian virtues more faithfully practised? In New England, generally, till of late, the same system has existed, and has any region of our country, or of the world, for so long a period been distinguished by a higher tone of moral and religious principle? So true is this, that in the new settlements of the west, if the traveller find a village with its meeting-house, and its minister, may he not fairly presume before hand, that its inhabitants are principally emigrants from New-England? Will it be said that these effects are to be ascribed to the peculiar character and circumstances of the first settlers of this part of our country? I believe it. But will any one maintain that the habits and sentiments of our forefathers have been transmitted without the aid of means; or must it be confessed, that their permanency is the natural consequence of the institutions they established, and handed down to us? Has the number of settled ministers been increased, or are the meeting-houses more crowded in Rhode Island, or New Hampshire, since these states departed from the system of their ancestors; or, does any one expect, that the sentiments and virtues of Christianity will henceforth start up with a more vigorous growth in Connecticut, now that the shades of a legal establishment have been swept away? In the Southern States, religion has been long left to take care of itself, and has it flourished more than in New-England? It is invidious to institute particular comparisons. Every one may be safely left to draw his own conclusions

from facts the most notorious. There is one circumstance, however, already noticed, to which I must be allowed again to refer, as bearing forcibly upon several of the points under discussion. While in the capital of Massachusetts the proportion of settled ministers to the population is one third less than in the state at large; in the Southern States this proportion is more than reversed.

It is a maxim in politics, that the actual results of any important change, often differ most widely from the anticipations of theory; and of course that innovations, though sometimes necessary to be made, are always experiments of hazard. This consideration ought to have the greatest weight in the present instance, because we may have all the advantage of the experiment, without any of the danger. The existing system is believed by many to have been productive of incalculable benefits; and by none will it be maintained to be an evil so intolerable as to demand an immediate alteration. In the neighbouring states the experiment of the change is now making. If upon full trial, this change should not be found to occasion the mischiefs that are apprehended from it, still more, if it should appear positively beneficial, we may at any time imitate their example, and reap all the advantages of their experience. But if, as is most solemnly feared by some of our wisest and best men, the reverse of all this should be proved by the event; if we should see in these states, notwithstanding the protracted operation of established sentiments and habits, one after another of the citizens, under various pretexts, withdrawing their aid from the support of religion, or neglecting to attach themselves to any society for that purpose, till the countenance of numbers shall take away the disgrace of singularity; if, as the necessary consequence of this, we should see parishes broken up, the clergy, from the poverty and precariousness of their support, losing their respectability, and men of talents no longer entering the profession; if we should see youth growing up without the regular instructions of the sabbath, the general sense of the sanctions of futurity disappearing, and the tone of morals universally relaxed; what reason shall we have to bless God, that we have been saved from evils so deplorable. Nor let it be thought, should we follow in this dangerous path, we might at any time retrace our steps. It is easy to relax existing obligations, but to bind them again upon men, when they have been once loosened, is at all times most difficult, and would in this case be impossible; since the very causes which would require such a measure, the increase of irreligion and vice, would most effectually prevent its adoption. Enthusiasm and fanaticism might still

occasionally shoot over the multitude, and shed on crowds of gazers a glare of wild and useless excitement; but a system of rational and regular instruction and worship could not be restored. That steady light, which shines into every man's dwelling, and guides him to his daily occupations and duties, which ripens the fruit and tinges the flowers of the earth, and spreads its brightness over a serene and glorious heaven, will have gone down upon us.

MISCELLANEOUS COLLECTIONS.

DR. MAYHEW.

WE extract with much pleasure the following Note to a Sermon preached on the Sunday after the funeral of Rev. Simeon Howard, D. D. and now published among "Sermons on particular occasions, by James Freeman, D. D., Minister of King's Chapel, Boston. Third edition. 1821."

"Dr. MAYHEW may with justice be denominated the first preacher of Unitarianism in Boston, and his religious society the first Unitarian Church. As this fact has lately been called in question by persons, who are unwilling to relinquish so great a name to a side which they call heresy, but who probably have not much knowledge of his writings, and have never conversed with the few surviving friends who still remember him, it is necessary that I should produce evidence of the truth of what I have affirmed. Omitting to cite any passages from his printed Discourses, and the Notes subjoined to them, the first witness I produce is the Rev. Isaac Smith, who informs me, that Dr. Mayhew was the principal means of the republication of Emlyn's Inquiry, which, as is well known to all who are acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of our country, excited much attention at its appearance, and to which an answer was written by President Burr. In this republication Dr. Mayhew was aided by his parishioners, and several other friends, particularly by the late General Palmer and Judge Cranch. I mention the names of these excellent men, because it may lead some persons to make farther inquiries, by which they will obtain additional proof.

"The second witness that I produce is the daughter of Dr. Mayhew, Mrs. Wainwright, who in a letter which I have lately received from her, in answer to one which I wrote on the subject, has put the question forever at rest. After saying, that she

has not the smallest doubt of the fulness of Dr. Howard's belief on this point, she proceeds thus :

"Respecting my father, there is no doubt that the clearest evidence may be given of his having asserted the unity of God in the most unequivocal and plain manner, as early as the year 1753. I have many sermons, from which it appears to me no one could for a moment question his belief. I have a set from the text, 'Prince of Peace.' In the first head he inquires, how Christ came by this title. He speaks of independent and derived authority, and says, 'The former belongs to God alone, who exists necessarily and independently. The Son of God, and all beings, who derive their existence from another, can have only a derived authority.' After speaking of various sources and kinds of authority, he says, 'Lastly, another source of authority is the positive will and appointment of God Almighty, the supreme Lord and Governour of the world; and this is indisputably the source of all that authority our Saviour is clothed with: His designation to royal power and exaltation to the throne was from his God and Father.' I can quote many, very many, passages expressive of the same sentiment: so that I have not the shadow of a doubt that my father was full and explicit in his avowal of this opinion from 1753; and perhaps I may get positive proof from an earlier date. I will continue my search, and shall with pleasure supply you with any proof in my power of the faith he was happy enough to enjoy, and courageous enough to avow at the risk of his temporal comfort." I may be allowed to add to this letter of Mrs. Wainwright, that when the assertion, that her father believed the doctrine of the Trinity, was first made several years ago, she expressed to me her surprise at so new a charge, of which she had never heard before.

"The third witness that I produce is the illustrious author of the following letter, which is published with his permission.

"DEAR DOCTOR,

"I thank you for your favour of the 10th, and the pamphlet enclosed, entitled, 'American Unitarianism.' I have turned over its leaves, and found nothing that was not familiarly known to me. In the preface, Unitarianism is represented as only thirty years old in New-England. I can testify as a witness to its old age. Sixty-five years ago, my own minister, the Rev. Lemuel Bryant; *Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, of the West Church in Boston*; the Rev. Mr. Shute, of Hingham; the Rev. John Brown, of Cohasset; and perhaps equal to all, if not above all, the Rev. Mr. Gay, of Hingham, were Unitarians. Among the laity how many could I name, lawyers, physicians, tradesmen,

farmers! But at present I will name only one, Richard Cranch, a man who had studied divinity, and Jewish and Christian antiquities, more than any clergyman now existing in New England. More than fifty years ago, I read Dr. Clarke, Emlyn, and Dr. Waterland: do you expect, my dear doctor, to teach me any thing new in favour of Athanasianism?—There is, my dear Doctor, at present existing in the world a Church Philosophick, as subtle, as learned, as hypocritical, as the Holy Roman Catholick, Apostolick, and Œcumenical Church. The Philosophical Church was originally English. Voltaire learned it from Lord Herbert, Hobbes, Morgan, Collins, Shaftsbury, Bolingbroke, &c. &c. &c. You may depend upon it, your exertions will promote the Church Philosophick, more than the Church Athanasian or Presbyterian. This and the coming age will not be ruled by inquisitions or Jesuits. The restoration of Napoleon has been caused by the resuscitation of inquisitors and Jesuits.

I am and wish to be

Your friend,

Quincy, May 15th, 1815.

JOHN ADAMS."

Rev. Dr. Morse.

"Another charge has been made against Dr. Mayhew, which his daughter has power to contradict. It is confessed by the authors of it, that Dr. Mayhew, in the former part of his ministerial life, was an Arminian and Unitarian; but they assert that, before his death, he renounced these heresies, and became a Trinitarian and Calvinist. If this is a fact, it is strange that it was never communicated to his parishioners, his family, and his intimate friends. The assertion is so entirely false, that the fact is that his friend, Dr. Cooper of Boston, visited Dr. Mayhew on his death bed, and inquired of him whether he still retained the religious sentiments which he had preached and published, and his answer was, "I hold fast my integrity." This information I have received from Mrs. Wainwright; and there can be no doubt of its truth.

"As however almost every false report is indirectly derived from something which is true, the pretence, that Dr. Mayhew changed his religious opinions, may have originated from a fact, which has come to my knowledge, and which probably, as it has passed from mouth to mouth, with a fate not unusual to such reports, has at last reached the ears of some persons disguised and altered in its most material circumstances. The truth is, that not long before the close of his life he expressed to several of his friends, and among others to the late Dr. West of Boston, from whom I received the account, his regret that he had published so

many tracts on polemical divinity, and that he had treated some of his adversaries, particularly Mr. Cleaveland, with so much asperity and contempt. Though he was confessedly a good and generous man, yet it must be acknowledged that in his triumphant career of controversy, urged on as he was by the applauding shouts of those, who admired the strength with which he wielded his arguments, he had sometimes aimed too rough and ponderous a weapon at the head of his opponents. But when, on serious and candid reflection, he perceived that he had unnecessarily inflicted pain, he lamented, that he had not always preserved the mild and christian spirit, which becomes a disciple of the meek and benevolent Jesus. The amount of all which is this : Dr. Mayhew regretted that, in his controversial writings, he had been occasionally betrayed into the language of severity ; and the expression of this regret is an honour to him ; but there is no evidence, that he ever classed any of his theological sentiments among his faults, or repented of and abjured any part of his former creed.

“ To prevent misconceptions, it may be proper to observe, that when I style Dr. Mayhew an Unitarian, I use the word in the sense in which it is commonly understood in America, as denoting those christians, who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, whether they believe the pre-existence of Christ, or not. Dr. Mayhew was an Unitarian of the school of Clarke ; and he admitted, not only the pre-existence, but the atonement of Christ.”

DR. MAYHEW'S WORKS.

MR. EDITOR,

I WISH to express to you the desire which many persons feel, that the works of Dr. Mayhew should be collected and published. Our country has produced few men more remarkable for their talents, learning, and public spirit, or whose writings have done more for the reputation of their country at home and abroad. He was one of those whose high honour it has been to take a stand in advance of the age in which they lived, and to urge it forward by the intrepidity of their own example, and by enlarged and fearless attempts to promote the progress of the human mind, in spite of all the clamour and obloquy of generations that feared to be wiser than their fathers. His works, therefore, deserve to have a permanent place in the collection of our theological literature. He did more, perhaps, than any other single man to promote that entire freedom of inquiry, and that equal enjoyment of religious rights, which it is so much our happiness to possess. His intrepid spirit overthrew the obsta-

cles which had gathered in the way of our religious independence, and restored to christians that liberty by which Christ had made them free, but which for so long a time they had but imperfectly enjoyed. It is not to our credit that his writings are scattered, and scarce, and but little known. We have collected and published the works of inferior men, whose contributions to the public good were comparatively small, and we suffer those of this eminent patriot and christian to languish in the obscure volumes in which they first saw the light. I have been gratified in hearing it suggested, that it is the intention of a gentleman, every way qualified, to issue proposals for the republication of all, or a part of the works of this valuable author. I trust the proposal, if it should be issued, will meet the approbation and encouragement of the christian public. I wish that your work, Mr. Editor, may do something to show how worthy a design it is. It is a duty thus to exhibit our gratitude for the instruments of religious improvement and reformation, which providence has granted us; and we should prove ourselves little worthy of our distinguished privileges, if we were willing that those books, which asserted and established them, should be longer unknown to ourselves and finally lost to our children.

A LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

[For the Christian Disciple.]

DUNCAN M'INTOSH.

To offer a notice of this departed Philanthropist for the Christian Disciple, is to concur, it is believed, with the objects of that publication. In a mercantile community it can never be unseasonable to record an exception to the sordid spirit of accumulation; and in a Christian country, it must always be salutary to contemplate the actual intrepidity and elevation of the Christian character, in opposition to what has been unfortunately asserted of its abjectness and pusillanimity.* We may not be as generally apprised in this, as in our southern capitals, that Mr. M'Intosh was at St. Domingo during the sanguinary revolution in that Island of 1793, which threatened the total extermination of the French inhabitants; and although (as an American citizen) he might have departed in safety, and taken with him the whole of his large property, he preferred remaining and sacrificing that property, together with the interesting hopes connected with its acquirement—to the preservation of the proscribed. At every hazard he continued during eight months, to freight vessels at his own expense, laden with these destitute fugitives, to the number

* Vide Paley and Jenyns.

of nine hundred men, and fifteen hundred women and children. At his subsequent arrival in Philadelphia, a gold medal, a public dinner, and every demonstration of enthusiastic respect, were rendered him by the gratitude of the exiles he had saved ; but for services like his, what are all sublunary rewards ? *Remuneratio ejus cum altissimo !*

HAIL, Son of ancient Caledon !
Thy race is sped, thy crown is won.
The voice Supreme thy worth must tell—
Ours only utters—"Hail—Farewell !"

Oft has offended Virtue's frown
Wither'd the chaplets of renown ;
Struck by the light'ning of her eye,
In their first blossoming, they die ;
And incense, fir'd to rise for years,
Is quench'd in her indignant tears.

Not to the just such fate is given—
Their Laurel is the growth of Heaven.
Seed, sown amid the storms of time,
Expands in that unclouded clime ;
The Virtues, Guardian Angels there,
Make the immortal plant their care ;
And heavenly hands its leaves suffuse
With moisture from celestial dews.
It feels the Sun's enliv'ning ray
Long ere he gilds our distant day ;
And winds from primal Eden's vales,
Breathe over it their balmiest gales.

And never tree of glory there,
Has tower'd more fragrant, full or fair,
Than that which waves its holy flower
O'er Duncan's high immortal bower.
Thou hero of an holier flame
Than boasts the ranks of martial fame !
Tho' honour'd still that steel must be
Which strikes for lawful liberty,
(Such as thy Wallace wont to wield,
Defender of his native field :)
Yet happier is that course maintain'd,
Whose trophies are with tears unstain'd ;
And worthier benisons should fall
On him, above each narrower call
Who risk'd his life—his wealth—his all—
With charity that knew no bound,
For strangers, on a foreign ground ;—
And felt the outcast alien blend
The claims of clansman, brother, friend !

What time against their ancient foes
 Dark Afric's race like Dæmons rose,
 Past wrongs with present strength conspiring,
 And memory all their passions firing,
 Till mad, and madd'ning all the throng,
 Freedom, a Fury, raved along,
 With garments roll'd in blood ; with hand
 Grasping the desolating brand :—
 What voice but thine alone, could dare
 Breathe the forbidden word—to spare ?
 From glens and caves the fugitive
 Could look to thee alone, and live :
 Whose shelt'ring arms, a rampart spread,
 Stood 'twixt the living and the dead,
 With angel eloquence to stay
 The carnage of that direful day.

And when the shield that sav'd before,
 From power incens'd could save no more,
 Thou gav'st the meed of years of toil,
 To waft them to a kindlier soil.
 Vain were the dungeon's terrors*—vain
 The threaten'd scaffold's penal stain—
 Ah vain those fonder thoughts, that prest
 For mastery in thy manly breast,
 And bade thee pause, nor forfeit now
 The nuptial torch, the mutual vow,
 The social hall, the festal dome,
 The comforts of the hearth and home !

O happy in the sacrifice !
 For what the suffering to the prize ?
 What, loss of all that earth holds dear,
 In such a high and proud career ?
 Let faith, prophetic faith, portray
 The glories of thy rising day,
 When grateful thousands shall proclaim,
 Their kind deliverer's honour'd name ;
 Sires hail him, who from direst rage
 Rescued the filial props of age ;
 And mothers bless the arm that stay'd
 From infant hearts the ruthless blade ;
 While, from before the mystic throne
 Erst to the Seer of Patmos shown,
 Sublimest welcome shall accord
 Thy great Exemplar and thy Lord !
 Who onward to his own abode
 Through sacrifice and suffering trode.

* Mr. M'Intosh was twice imprisoned, and narrowly escaped death by his efforts in this cause.

Endur'd each earthly—heavenly loss,
Renounc'd a kingdom for a cross,
Cheerful, himself for others gave,
And liv'd to bless, and died to save !

[The following Hymn, written by a Lady of the society, was sung at the ordination of Rev. Charles Brooks, to the pastoral charge of the third church and society in Hingham, Jan. 15th 1821.]

Keep silence all—'tis hallow'd ground,
The Saviour's presence shines around.
Say, will not God vouchsafe to hear
The prayer of those who worship here ?

Not as on Sinai's awful brow,
We view thy glorious brightness now ;
But as on Bethlehem's flowery plains,
When angels chanted heavenly strains.

May Peace within these borders reign,
May gentle Love and all her train,
Sweet Charity and holy fire
Thy humble votaries here inspire.

Thou chosen Watchman of this band,
Oh ! lead them with a Shepherd's hand :
Cement their hearts with Truth and Love,
And join them to the Lamb above.

REVIEW.

The Natural History of the Bible ; or, a Description of all the Quadrupeds, Birds, Fishes, Reptiles and Insects, Trees, Plants, Flowers, Gums, and Precious Stones, mentioned in the sacred Scriptures. Collected from the best authorities, and alphabetically arranged. By THADDEUS MASON HARRIS, D.D. Boston : Wells and Lilly, 1820. pp. 476. 8vo. price bound, three dollars.

THE public are already sufficiently informed of the claims, with which this work offers itself to their notice : that it is the fruit of many years study, gathered with unwearied diligence,
New Series—vol. IH. 7

and from a wide search. We have to thank the learned author for presenting us with a book, containing such a variety of information on so many subjects ; of easy reference, and on a new plan. We feel indebted to him for having brought together from many rare, and many cumbrous volumes, the materials, which we might not very willingly have else sought for ; and for disposing these materials in so skilful an arrangement and under so agreeable a form, that they may be enjoyed by those who are not conversant with studies of this nature, while they afford aid to the professed biblical scholar. The work is not, however, a mere compilation : illustrations are suggested not unfrequently by the author, and some of the best belong fairly to him. Indeed we were left to regret from the beginning to the end, that there was not more of this kind ; that he has quoted from others, when he would have spoken better himself ; that he has given us so many of their opinions, and no greater number of his own. He has endeavoured to make his subjects engaging by frequent allusions to classical and modern writers, and by interspersing such remarks as the occasion happened to furnish. His articles are consequently sometimes of a very miscellaneous character ; but this is perfectly consistent with his design, and it is no small praise to supply a manual for the learned, and at the same interest the common reader. Whether this object has been perfectly accomplished remains to be seen. We will not anticipate the judgment of the public. We will only say, that the investigations are generally laboured ; and that many of the observations on particular passages of the sacred writings cannot but be universally acceptable.

The subjects of natural history which are found in the Bible have called out at different times a great deal of learning ; and we cannot help thinking, a great deal of tedious and useless learning. We have had all sorts of minute questions and laborious trifles respecting them ; and theories and assertions have been as various and opposite as they are unimportant. We are not prepared to say that an extravagant value has of late years been attached to this branch of inquiry ; though we confess we are astonished, when we think how small is the advantage that has been derived, compared with the zeal that has been shown : how little true light has been thrown on the pages of scripture by all that has been said and written and done. In the middle of the last century, great preparations were made for exploring the East, especially Palestine ; that its natural productions might be accurately ascertained, with reference to the illustration of the Scriptures. "A mission of learned men" was dispatched, by the munificent patronage of the king of Denmark, at the instance of professor Michaelis, and with in-

structions from that celebrated scholar. We have never heard, however, that any great good followed the enterprize. A book from Niebuhr, one of the expedition, was given to the public; which, as Dr. Harris tells us in his preface, "is valuable for a few incidental remarks, and as giving the names, by which animals and plants are now called in those regions." A few years before this, Dr. Hasselquist, a pupil of Linnæus, employed himself a long time in Egypt and the Holy Land collecting specimens with a similar view. His papers were published by Linnæus, and translated into English: but we are unable to perceive how the student of the Bible can owe any considerable obligation to them. The first half is a mere journal, even more wandering and heavily particular than writings of this kind commonly are: the latter part has indeed a distinct object; but its utility, however great it may be to the inquisitive naturalist, is of a very humble kind so far as the Bible is concerned. We do not mean that the natural history of the East is not important to the accurate understanding of many passages of the Scriptures. We do not mean to deny that something valuable has been accomplished in this service, by means of it. But we think, that beyond that general acquaintance with the subject, which is easily obtained and understood, it is rather curious than useful, and deserves no great rank among our biblical studies. It appears to us that the important questions in it, which have been fairly and fully settled, are extremely few; and that the minutiae, into which it is perpetually extending itself, are to the last degree, barren and wearisome. We confess that there is no subject, on which we have been made so heartily tired with far fetched analogies, and fanciful derivations, and long drawn discussions, and conjectures which would not be of the least consequence if they were demonstrations. What is still worse than this, it has given occasion to a great many pretended elucidations of holy writ; and one is continually disgusted with the trifling remarks that lay claim to this title, and the tasteless pedantry that is brought up to disfigure and spoil the beautiful simplicity of the Scriptures. We shall find opportunity to present our readers with some specimens of this, before we dismiss the present article; and will say no more here of those, who have written expressly and merely on the natural productions of the East.

But there is another class of writings, closely kindred to this, relating to the same object, and full of the same faults, on which we will briefly offer our opinion. We mean those, which treat in general of what is to be seen in Palestine and the neighbouring countries; whether in the form of voyages and

travels, or of collected observations, fragments, &c. Authorities in this kind have become very numerous; and the diligent author of the work before us has availed himself very freely of their researches. We must acknowledge, however, for ourselves, that their value seems to us to have been much overrated, considered as helps to the understanding of the Bible. Learned they often are, and occasionally serviceable; and among the great variety of them from Dr. Shaw to Dr. Adam Clarke, it would be wonderful indeed if many valuable facts had not been collected. But what a multitude of words have we for a little profit! How much of what is to no purpose compared with what is truly instructive! Among the most recent and celebrated of these productions is Dr. Clarke's edition of Harmer's "Observations on various passages of Scripture:" a book which has been a great deal quoted and praised. For our own part, we are inclined to set it at small value. It abounds with insipid and dull things; and the portions that deserve and reward attention are hidden in a crowd of remarks of an opposite description. One cannot contain his surprize, that four full volumes, collected under such advantages and from so many sources, published by one distinguished scholar, and after a number of years enlarged and edited by another, should contain so small a portion of what is worth remembering. Our author has made pretty copious extracts from an anonymous publication called "Scripture illustrated;" which appeared as an appendix to Calmet's dictionary, and was "conducted principally," as the title page tells us, "by the English editor of that work." It is really a very trifling book, flippantly written, and out of meagre materials; with more fancy than knowledge; at a good half of which we should laugh if it were not for vexation. The composer of it seems equally at home in Niebuhr and L'Allegro; and illustrates the Bible now from the Rabbins and now "*the ludicrous Butler*,"—who would not, we think, feel much complimented by the epithet. Plainly, we account it good for almost nothing, notwithstanding all the pretensions of engravings and quarto; and think it goes to disgrace those venerable writings, which it presumes to call "emanations from the Divine Mind." We shall be obliged to take further notice of this writer, when we come to examine more particularly the contents of the volume under review: from which we fear we have already detained our readers too long.

The excellent author prefixes to his main work three dissertations; the last of which, and the only one that is of considerable length, is an able account of the "Mosaical distinction of animals into clean and unclean." His familiarity with writings

of the most various kinds induces him sometimes to quote more than the subject requires; and now and then to set before us opinions, for nothing else than to show us how ridiculous those of learned men can sometimes be. He cites for instance these remarks of Ainsworth: "the *parting of the hoof* signified the right discerning of the word and will of God, the difference between the law and the gospel, and the walking in obedience to the word of God with the right foot. The *chewing of the cud* signified the meditating in the law of God night and day," &c. This, he says, is extending the reasons of the Mosaic precepts "to the borders of mysticism:"—we presume he means the further borders. At any rate, there is something amusing in such instances when introduced sparingly: and on such an opportunity no one ought to be displeased, that the most absurd side of a question should be allowed to say its two or three words.

We now come to the atticles of the work itself, arranged in their alphabetical order. We have first the name of the animal or vegetable, the fossil, or other substance, as it stands in our common translation: next to it is the Hebrew word, from which it was translated; or the Greek one if the original is in that language. Connected with the Hebrew is the correspondent name, when it is of a similar sound, in the kindred or derived languages,—the Chaldee or Syriac, Aethiopic or Phenician, Arabic, or Turkish, or Persian; the Greek or Latin name is added, when it appears to have descended from the Hebrew; and every word in the Oriental languages is expressed in the letters of our own alphabet, so that the most common reader can judge in some degree of the resemblance. We are then told, if it is of consequence, in what passages the term in question occurs. If there has been any controversy respecting its meaning, either generally, or in any particular connexion, the authorities on each side are fairly stated. A description is also added,—a scientific one whenever the case requires or easily admits of it, of the subject of the article; and the whole is illustrated with a great variety of references. The places, in which the word is used, are often critically examined; and many passages of scripture are either explained by allusion, or presented in a new translation. This is the form of the work. Of the manner, in which the author has executed his task, we have already offered a cursory judgment. Too much praise cannot be given to the fidelity and diligence, with which he has elaborated almost every part. He has extracted honey where there was no smell of flowers: and even "Scripture illustrated" has been compelled to contribute something not undeserving of attention. The

fruits of much and various reading are to be seen throughout. Indeed we have been sometimes ready to complain at the profusion: to think we have too much of the speculations of others, and to wish that the author had exercised a little more freely his own good judgment. Under the article "Fox," for instance, we might have been content to dispense with several of the pages that relate to the story of Samson's fox tails, and after reading patiently through more opinions about them than we care to remember, one is disappointed, to be sent away with the declaration, that the compiler has no opinion to give on the subject. This is being too diffident of himself: and in many places, we fear that the partiality of friendship and the reverence for high authorities have induced him to ascribe more value to the suggestions and theories, which have been furnished him, than they can fairly claim.

The longest and one of the most interesting articles in the book, is "LEVIATHAN." We fully agree to the assertion, that there is now no reasonable doubt of the kind of animal described under that appellation: it is certainly the crocodile of the Nile. The 41st chapter of Job is a noble description of him: the whole of which is presented by Dr. Harris, in a new translation. This version is in many points much finer than that which is in common use. A clearer and more correct meaning is given to several passages, and the language altogether is more striking. We cannot but think, however, that in the first verse the author has been misled by a bad authority; and one which, in other places, he himself disregards. We mean that of Mr. Vansittart, who published "Remarks critical and philological on Leviathan described in the 41st chapter of Job," at Oxford in 1810. He found, it seems, in his Herodotus, that it was common in some parts of Egypt to bring up a single crocodile with the utmost care, to feed him with sacred food, and to set off his uncouth form with bracelets and rings, regarding him as the emblem of the Divinity. He endeavoured to show, therefore, that reference was here had to the state of Leviathan, as he was actually to be seen in the hands of the priests, decked with his holy ornaments. Dr. Harris it would also seem, had been consulting Herodotus, and discovered that the crocodile was sometimes to be taken with a hook and bait; adding this, then, to the notion of Mr. Vansittart, that the leading about of a tame crocodile was intended, he renders:

1. "*Behold Leviathan! whom though leadest about with a hook,
Or a rope, which thou fastenest to his snout.*"
2. *Hast thou put a ring in his nose,
Or pierced his cheek through with a clasp?"*

The first glance at these verses shows us how ill, when thus represented, they agree together. Why is the first verse without the interrogative form, which belongs to the six following verses? The language is ironical from first to last: and to understand any part in any other way is to destroy the whole pertinency and effect. The object of the description is to show how vain is human strength, when employed against the tremendous "king over all the sons of the fierce:" and the poet begins with the taunting question: "Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook,—with a rush?" This was as it appeared in Dr. Harris's first edition, and his second thought is certainly, in this instance, not the best. We have but to read on to be perfectly convinced of this.

"Has he made many supplications to thee?"

* * * * *

Hast thou played with him as a bird?

Wilt thou engage him for thy maidens?" &c.

We hear evidently the tone of disdainful sarcasm throughout. Indeed how preposterous would it be to introduce such a sublime description of the might and terror of a formidable monster, by pointing to a tame creature, subdued with hook and line, or tricked out for a superstitious pageant! The style soon after rises from derision to a terrific majesty.

"None is so resolute that he dare rouse him;
Who then is able to contend with ME?"

* * * * *

At his rising the mighty are alarmed.
He regardeth iron as straw,
Copper as rotten wood;
Like stubble is the battle-axe reputed,
And he laugheth at the quivering of the javelin."

Immediately preceding the account of Leviathan in the book of Job, is that of BEHEMOTH, which is contained in the ten last verses of the 40th chapter. The article that relates to him is composed with ability; perspicuously, and with greater singleness of thought than that which we have just mentioned. The author maintains after Bochart, and we think successfully, that the river-horse is here designated: his reasons are assigned simply; and without any of that distraction, which we think is now and then produced by the multiplicity of the writers whom he has consulted. The following verses in his translation are very beautiful:

"He sheltereth himself under the shady trees,
In the coverts of the reeds and in ooze;

The branches tremble as they cover him,
The willows of the stream while they hang over him."

Though we are by no means satisfied that they do not contain one beauty more than is found in the original.

We willingly accept two good English names, which convey some meaning to us, instead of Leviathan and Behemoth: but we cannot help observing, that there is a contrary tendency in the books, which Dr. Harris most cites and prizes;—to give us hard foreign words instead of those that are plainly intelligible. Besides that the Hebrew name is sometimes held to, we have thought, a little too fondly, we are presented with modern words of very doubtful sound and awkward appearance. It is perhaps natural enough that travellers, and they who glean from travels in the East, should fall into this way of employing their knowledge: but they should be careful that the scriptures are not marred by their imaginary improvements. What are we to think, when that fine passage in Proverbs: 'So shall thy poverty rush on like an invader, and thy want as an armed man,' becomes in the hands of the continuator of Calmet, 'So shall thy poverty advance as rapidly as an express; and thy penury as a strong and swift *aûshare rider*.'? In a similar taste, though much more defensible, are the following lines in Joel's sublime description of the devastation produced by an army of locusts, as they appear in Dr. Harris's version:

'What the GAZAM leave, the ARBEH devour;
What the ARBEH leave, the JALEK devour;
What the JALEK leave, the CHASIL devour.'

The use of these Hebrew names is only an imposing way of confessing that their import is not understood: and though the author, at the outset of his observations under the head 'Locust,' says he 'shall endeavour to give an explanation of each of these names, with the aim to identify the several species, and elucidate the passages of scripture in which they are mentioned;' it is evident from the contradictory opinions which he cites that the learned have arrived at no certainty on the subject. His translation virtually acknowledges the same thing. Our common version is much to be preferred; for 'palmer-worm,' 'locust,' 'canker-worm,' and 'caterpillar,' whether right or wrong, have the advantage of meaning something, and of being English. But we are inclined to think, that while we know so little of the several species here designated, the words of the Prophet cannot be better represented than thus:

What one locust has left, another has eaten:
What he has left, a third has eaten;
What the third has left, a fourth has eaten.

We cannot agree with the learned author in the last remark which he makes under this article. He cannot think that John the Baptist ate locusts in the wilderness, because they would need smoking and salting at least, which would seem but a troublesome and unspiritual operation for the Baptist to attend to; though he grants that these insects were eaten in the East, and were common food for the poorer class of people. 'The word in the original' he says, 'signifies also *buds* or *Pods* of trees, as several learned men have proved.' We confess we know of no such proof. *Αγκίδες* means locusts: and as for Henry Stephens' conjecture of *Αχραδες*, wild pears, we have never heard that it has been adopted by any critic.

While we are on the subject of hard words, transferred from eastern tongues, it may not be out of place to remark, that the charge of being obscure and singular, if not unintelligible, will apply to some of the English sentences, which have gained admission among Dr. Harris's illustrations. How, indeed, was it to be expected, that from such a crowd of books, something of this kind should not occasionally have eluded his vigilance and found its way into his work? What idea could the translator of Hafiz think he was expressing by lines like these?

'Tell to that tender fawn, O zephyr! tell
O'er rocks, o'er desert hills, she makes me dwell.
Whence has such sweetness—(ever may she live!)
No blest remorse her honeyed bard to give?

The author of 'Scripture Illustrated,' who is a frequent offender in this way, furnishes us with another example, in his translation of that very doubtful passage, Psalms lxxviii: 12, 13. In the received version we read: 'Kings of armies did flee apace: and she that tarried at home divided the spoil. Though ye have lien among the pots, *yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, &c.*' The following is the lucid language of the writer referred to:

'Kings and armies did flee, did flee,
And the homestead of their pursuers divided the spoil,
Yes, surely, ye cast down among the crooks of war
The dove of wings, imbricated with silver, &c.'

He is perhaps right in supposing that by 'the dove' is here intended the military ensign of the Syrians: but this conjecture, if true, which is yet not fully established, is no discovery of his own. It was suggested first, as Dr. Geddes tells us, by Mr. L'Advocat. The whole passage, in connection with what follows it, remains still one of the most obscure in the Old Testament; and such a critic as the author of 'Scripture Illustrated,' we can-

not think the most happily chosen to throw light upon it. Dr. Geddes tells us that he had a long labour in this difficult place, and they who are not pleased with his translation may 'lie among the pots' as long as they choose.

We will dwell no longer on what seem to us to be blemishes in this valuable production of a scholar, whom we highly respect: but will only add a regret, that in a few instances he has not sufficiently distinguished his own judgment from that of the writer whom he quotes. Michaelis' opinion of the plastered stones in Deuteronomy xxvii. contained in his 'Commentaries on the Laws of Moses,' is really the most strange that is to be found in that very strange and unequal work. Yet it is given without any other comment than a counter opinion from Dr. Geddes. A part of what is said on the 175th page, of the plague of frogs, creates no surprise, as coming from Dr. Adam Clarke: but it is only doing justice to Dr. Harris to declare, that he is himself utterly incapable of saying any thing so silly.

The indices that are placed at the end of the volume deserve notice, as they are drawn up with faithful accuracy, and at no small pains, and contribute to the utility of the work. The first index is a list of the articles according to the English translation; with the original names, and the Linnæan or scientific appellations, in parallel columns. The second refers to a number of articles incidentally mentioned; some of which are curious, and some really important. The third points out the passages of which either a new translation is given, or a particular illustration is attempted.

The public is indebted to the author for a work excellent in its kind. Perhaps he has made it too learned to suit the great mass of the reading community; and if it should prove so, he will not probably be disappointed at it. By those, however, who feel an interest in the subjects of which it treats, it will be consulted with pleasure; and the critical student of the Bible will find it an agreeable accession to his books of reference.

ARTICLE II.

Explanation of the views of the Society for employing the poor; with the Constitution and By-laws; and an extract from the report of the Managers, for the first three months. Boston, July, 1820.

It is mortifying to the hopes of the philanthropist, and puts a check upon the exertions of the charitable, to observe how rarely an

intimate knowledge of the vices and the wants of our fellow creatures is connected with the desire of aiding in the correction of the one or the relief of the other. It is discouraging to mark how seldom they who are thought, or who think themselves practical, judicious men, skilful in judging of the motives and character of those about them, and able to avail themselves of the good or bad qualities, the strength or the weakness of others for their own purposes, are willing to engage in any project which has for its end either the moral or the physical improvement of mankind. They fancy themselves to know too well the incorrigible and obstinate nature of men to expect to improve them by their feeble efforts, and they are sure that every shilling which is bestowed upon a mendicant in whatever form,—the price even of the Bible itself—only goes to swell the profits of the licensed retailer of spirituous liquors. The more they have known of mankind, the worse have they found them; and forgetting that the worse men are, the greater efforts are requisite for their reformation, they content themselves with exhibiting their knowledge at the expense of their wisdom, and muster up their philosophy to bear with the world as they find it. They are apt to leave the merit of establishing and conducting many of the institutions for charitable purposes to those who have less knowledge of human nature, and less skill in managing it, more enthusiasm, and strength of feeling, with less of judgment to direct it. Thus it has happened that the character of the object has become associated with the character of those who are willing to devote their time and labour to the promotion of it, and *charitable* and *visionary* have become almost convertible terms. This reluctance to benevolent exertion, which is so obvious and so lamentable in men of prudence and worldly wisdom, has been very much strengthened by the general reception of the modern theory of population and political economy; and because it has been satisfactorily proved, that suffering must exist in the world, it has been thought futile to attempt to relieve it, or to prevent its increase. It has even been seriously urged, that by saving men from the consequences of vice and folly, we are running counter to the disciplinary designs of Providence, and that true benevolence is that which leaves men to the bitterest effects of guilt and error. This unfeeling and unchristian doctrine has not seldom been maintained since the publication of Mr. Malthus's work, and thus an argument, which would have disgraced the thirteenth century, has been deduced from the philosophy of the nineteenth. It is an argument which must rest for support on a proposition, which seems itself to require proof, that the

human race is not designed by its Maker to improve in physical, intellectual, or moral condition by their own exertions, and that it is their duty to submit to whatever evils they may be suffering, without an effort or a wish to remove them. It is an argument, too, which makes the world a scene of probation in this respect for only one portion of its inhabitants,—those, who are wicked enough to bring calamities upon their own heads, or so unfortunate as to be weighed down by the misconduct of others and the various accidents of life, or who are too weak, or unskilful, or ignorant to avoid them. But if it is the duty of these to gather instruction and to improve under their bitter experience, what is the duty, and what is the proof of the virtue of those, who possess the means and opportunity of lessening the severity or the length of their trials? who might inform the ignorance which allows, or relieve the wants which urge them to be guilty and miserable? Is there no correspondence between the situation of the poor, and the duty of the rich? between the necessities of the ignorant, and the abilities of those who are better informed? For what purpose are the goods of this world unequally bestowed, but for the trial of the virtue of both classes,—those who abound, and those who suffer need? If we are to avoid relieving the necessitous, till we are sure that we are not encouraging vice, till it is ascertained to be a fact that every man has learnt from experience that wickedness brings misery in its train, we fear that the evils incurred will be infinitely greater than those which are avoided. The vices of one class will not be prevented, while the peculiar virtues of another will be annihilated. The true inference from the unquestionable fact, that benevolent exertions are frequently unavailing and perverted, and that kindness is sometimes requited by obstinate villany, is, that these efforts and this liberality have been misapplied and ill-judged; not that it is unnecessary to be benevolent, much less that it is wrong, but that it is equally necessary to be cautious as to be kind, to be prudent as to be generous. And will the rich and the wise sit down contented to be surpassed in ingenuity by the poor and the ignorant? or should they not rather be excited, by the perversion of their bounty from its intended course, to devise new expedients to benefit those who are their own worst enemies? Will they be persuaded that because their indolent and ill-directed, or even their more judicious and considerate efforts at charity, have been unavailing, therefore no ingenuity can devise and no patience execute a more effectual plan? The more difficult it is, the greater is the necessity and the stronger the call upon men of talents, of practical skill, and of sound judgment, to engage

in such undertakings, and they will at least deserve the praise of combating, and, we trust, of conquering difficulties.

We take great pleasure in again calling the attention of our readers, and requesting their patronage to a society, in the organization and conduct of which there appears to have been thus far an uncommon union of zeal and discretion. Without any extravagant expectations of operating an immediate and violent change in the moral habits of the lower classes of the community, the Society for Employing the Poor have undertaken what, it seems to us, will, upon their plan, be neither difficult in the execution nor doubtful in its success. They propose to furnish employment for those of the poor who may be disposed to request it;—not at the usual rates, for it would be impossible in that case to supply all who would make application, but at something less than the ordinary wages of labour; thus offering a resource to the destitute, without presenting a temptation to those who are in regular employment. “On the other hand, the common standard price will be charged by the Society for the labour done. Were it not so, a temptation would be offered to withdraw work from the valuable class of labouring poor, and bring it to the Society, thus depriving many industrious persons of the occupations on which they depend. Such an effect, it is manifest, would increase instead of diminishing the evil, and would be directly opposite to the main design of the Institution.” This appears to us exceedingly judicious. We are indeed compelled to yield our unqualified approbation to the whole theory of this excellent Institution, and we have only to hope that its operations may be guided by the same zeal which led to its establishment, and the same skill which dictated its provisions. There are two points only to which we wish to direct the attention of the managers. The first is, the selecting and retaining of a judicious and attentive agent. It is obviously of the last importance to the usefulness of the society, that the agent should be both able and willing to carry its plans into effect, and it requires no small share of discretion and diligence to do this in the best manner. We are happy to learn that such is the character of the present agent, and we trust such a one will always be found, for upon that, we conceive, rests in a great degree, the success and usefulness of the society. The other is, the prudent regulation of the quantity of work distributed. There is a strong temptation in a new institution like this, to make unnecessary and injurious exertions in the outset. It is far better that the quantity of work should at first be less, than that it should be greater, than the society can continue to supply. A steady and regular in-

crease is an object to be particularly desired any diminution in the quantity, is not merely a diminution of the good accomplished, but a creation of positive evil, producing new disappointment and suffering in those who have been benefited by the existence of such a society. It would be better that such a one should never have been formed, than that in its commencement it should furnish a considerable quantity of material for exercising the industry of the poor, which should gradually decrease with the cooling zeal of the members. It seems particularly desirable, too, at first view, to furnish employment for as great a number as possible; but the same quantity of work, which, distributed among many, will be productive of little benefit to each individual, might be so arranged as to give important relief to a smaller number; and thus produce, as we think, the greatest good on the whole.

We would caution our readers against running into the error of supposing that they will acquit themselves of all their obligations to the poor by giving them something to do, or that by sending work to this society they can at once be charitable and thrifty. The following extract from the Explanation of the View of the Society, sets in a just light what should be the object of every subscriber.

‘These charitable purposes will, it is hoped, be kept constantly in view by those, whose humanity may induce them to become contributors. They should remember, that however their own convenience may sometimes be promoted by employing the labour of the poor, it is not for that purpose the Society exists. In sending work, let them consider rather the good that may be done for others, than the advantage that may result to themselves. Let them study to select such kinds of employment as will best answer the benevolent design of the Institution. Let them not confine themselves simply to what their own occasions may demand, but often send their work with no other view, than to encourage and assist the poor. It is especially desirable, that the employment given should be something added to the stock of labour, demanding the services of the poor, and not a portion taken from some to be given to others. Hence, if the work hitherto done in families, whose circumstances are easy, should hereafter be done through the Society, its design will be most effectually promoted. Hence too the importance of devising new modes of employment, of introducing arts and fabrics which before have been unknown or little used among us. Every such addition enables some one to provide more easily for himself or his family.’

To those who have such views, and who are willing to devote their time and attention to such objects, we most cordially wish success; and we view as a pledge of success the happy union of ardour and prudence, which has marked the commence-

ment of the institution. It has been begun and is principally supported by individuals of that sex, one of whose distinguishing excellences is a 'charity which never faileth.'

They may be encouraged to perseverance, we think, by the result of the many and laboured investigations into the causes of pauperism and the means of its relief which have been made in England. All that has been ascertained there tends to show, that the surest and best mode of giving assistance to the poor, is to afford them the materials and the inducement to labour; and we are happy to perceive, that the attention of our own legislature has been directed to this important subject, by an able and judicious report made, during the session of this winter, by the present speaker of the House of Representatives. This report, with the accompanying documents, abundantly confirms the conclusion which we cannot but regard as established; and we recommend the perusal of it to those who have any doubts as to the expediency or the practicability of giving employment to the poor.

The ladies who have instituted this society for the purpose, may justly boast of having acted upon a principle which is now sanctioned by legislative wisdom, and we do not feel it necessary for us to exhort those to perseverance, who seem to have so well considered what they were undertaking. We would only do what in us lies, to urge and excite many to follow the admirable example which a few have given. We understand that the funds of the society are yet inadequate to the accomplishing of all that the benevolent projectors are desirous of performing, and we should be much gratified to observe a few more names of those of our own sex on the list of subscribers. We think they will rarely find a better opportunity for charity; and we would remind all, both the wise and simple, the prudent and the undiscerning, that 'he who giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord.'

INTELLIGENCE.

[We have received the following communication from a member of the Rev. Mr. Peabody's Society at Springfield, relating to a sort of excommunication of his church by their brethren of the first church in that place; according to the advice of an ecclesiastical council. Viewed merely in relation to those who are the

objects of this vote of the first church, the affair appears to be of a character to be laughed at and forgotten. But it has another aspect. Nothing subjects men to more contempt than the impotent expressions of ill will having its origin in any unworthy feelings. If any portion of the clergy will be engaged in transactions of this sort, that portion of the clergy cannot hope to retain the respect of the community. They are bringing disgrace upon themselves ;—and that any of the ministers of religion should disgrace themselves, we do not think a slight evil. But, what is far worse, they expose religion itself to contempt ; for men are too ready to believe, that what is done by its professors, and especially what is done in its name, is conformable to its spirit. It is therefore because we wish the clergy to be respectable, and religion to be respected, that we view the transaction at Springfield with somewhat different feelings from what it might otherwise excite.]

In January 1809, the Rev. Samuel Osgood was with great unanimity ordained pastor of the first church and parish in Springfield. Soon after his ordination, he began to advance doctrines which many of his people considered unscriptural, and inconsistent with those he had avowed in public and private, while preaching on probation for settlement. In consequence of this and sundry other things, which I forbear to mention, there was in a few years, a strong and growing disaffection to Mr. Osgood in the parish. In June 1818, a petition was presented to the legislature, signed by a respectable number of the church and parish, to be incorporated into a separate society. The reason assigned was, that Mr. Osgood had changed his theological sentiments, and that they could not profit by his ministry. At a parish meeting however, in December 1818, the aggrieved, (for so I think they should be denominated) presented a memorial to the parish stating the reasons of their proceedings ; and being very unwilling to separate from their brethren, desired the majority to unite with them in adopting measures for an amicable dismissal of Mr. Osgood, and the settlement of another man, in whom they might all be united ; but this was refused. The petitioners for a new society then requested an equitable division of the parish fund, which consisted of nine thousand dollars ; but this was not granted. They then requested that as the parish were about to erect a new meeting-house, the old one might be sold to them at a fair price. This was also refused. An individual of their number then made a proposition to the other petitioners, that if they would provide a fund for the support of a Minister, he would build a meeting-house at his own

expense, and present it to the society. The proposal was immediately accepted, and an elegant house was erected (which was dedicated in January 1820,) and a permanent fund of sixteen thousand dollars established, for the support of a minister. The society was incorporated during the session of the General Court in January, 1819. In August, 1819, those members of the second society who were members of the first church, presented the following request :

To the Reverend Samuel Osgood and the Church under his pastoral care.

REVEREND AND BELOVED,

We the subscribers, members of this church, having become members of the second Congregational Society in this parish, and being desirous of uniting with sundry members of other churches in said society, and to be gathered into a regular Christian Church, that we may enjoy the benefits of divine ordinances, do hereby request your certificate that we are members in full communion with this church, and also that you would recommend us to the fellowship and christian watch of God's people ; wishing you grace, mercy and peace from God, we subscribe ourselves your friends and brethren in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel,

(Signed)

JONATHAN DWIGHT,
and twenty-four others.

No answer could be obtained, although repeatedly solicited. After waiting about two months for an answer, an Ecclesiastical Council was called by the advice of the Rev. Dr. Lathrop, who would have met with the council, had it not been for his age and infirmities, but afterwards expressed his full approbation of their proceedings, of which the following is a copy.

“ At an ecclesiastical Council, convened by letters missive, in the first parish in Springfield, October 27, 1819, for the purpose of organizing several members of churches in this neighbourhood into a Christian church, were present ;

<i>Pastors.</i>	<i>Delegates.</i>
From the Church in Suffield, Rev. Ebenezer Gay.	Br. Howard Alden.
Westfield, Rev. Isaac Knapp.	Br. Augustus Collins.
West Springfield, Rev. W. B. Sprague.	Deacon Peletiah Bliss.
and the Rev. Danl. Huntington.	

The Rev. Mr. Gay was chosen moderator, and Rev. Mr. Sprague scribe. The Council was opened with prayer by the Moderator. The Committee by whom the letters missive were signed, then proceeded to make a statement of facts, which have resulted in the convocation of this council.

A communication was then exhibited from the first church in Springfield, requesting that the Council now convened should adjourn till after the meeting of a council contemplated by them at a future period, as soon as may be convenient.

The Council, after duly considering this instrument, voted, unanimously, to proceed to the business for which they are convened.

The Committee then presented a paper, containing a solemn covenant,* subscribed by thirty-one persons, members of the second Congregational Society of the first parish in Springfield, in which they engage in the fear and love of God, to walk together as a Christian church in the faith and order of the gospel. The Council, having received satisfactory evidence that each of those persons were members of Congregational Churches in regular standing, and having received a declaration from them that they are satisfied with the mode of admission adopted in years past by Rev. Mr. Howard,

Voted, unanimously, that they be and hereby are organized into a regular church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be known as the second Congregational Church in the first parish of Springfield: that they be vested with all the powers, and entitled to all the privileges of a Christian Church, that we cordially give to them the hand of Christian fellowship, acknowledging them as brethren in one common Lord, and recommending them to the communion of all God's people.

(Signed)

EBENEZER GAY, *Moderator.*

Attest, WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, *Scribe.*"

After the very harmonious settlement of the Rev. William B. O. Peabody, over the new society, in October last, it was fondly hoped that the members of both societies would cast the mantle of charity over every unpleasant event which might have occurred in consequence of the separation, and study the things that make for peace; and in a short time restore that harmony

* The following is a copy of the Covenant referred to:

"We, the Subscribers, disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, do hereby, in the fear and love of God, enter into solemn covenant with each other, to walk together as a Christian church, in the faith and order of the Gospel; and we do engage to cultivate and cherish in our hearts a sacred regard for the character and word of God, and the institutions of the blessed Gospel: we do also engage to make the Word of God the only rule of our faith and practice, humbly relying on the merits and mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ for pardon and eternal life; we do also engage with brotherly regard and affection to watch over, to admonish, to instruct and to comfort one another, according to the word of God as occasion and opportunity may require. Praying for all men, that the kingdom of God may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

and good neighbourhood which had so long and so honorably characterized the whole parish. But this hope has been disappointed. In January of the present year, the following extraordinary vote was passed by the first church in Springfield.

"Whereas Jonathan Dwight, Rev. Bezaleel Howard, &c. [Here follow in the original the names of twenty-three others, members of the Rev. Mr. Peabody's church] without a regular dismission or recommendation, left this church, and were professedly organized with others, and denominated a church in the third society in this town, in the month of October, 1819, and for some months before had, and ever since have absented themselves from worship and communion with this church, therefore, pursuant to the advice of the council called by this church, to advise them as to their present duty, in respect to the said persons—

"*Voted*, That as they have gone out from us, they be no longer regarded as of us, and that this church do hereby withdraw its watch and fellowship from them.

"A true copy,

"(Signed)

SAMUEL OSGOOD, *Moderator*.

"*Springfield, Jan. 5, 1821.*"

The Council mentioned in the above vote was understood to be formed by the following clergymen:

Rev. Dr. Chapin, of Weathersfield,

Rev. Dr. Hyde, of Lee,

Rev. Dr. Shephard, of Lenox,

Rev. Mr. Snell, of North Brookfield,

Rev. Mr. Humphreys, of Pittsfield.

It is understood that these gentlemen were all present, with the exception of Dr. Hyde, of Lee.

The Rev. Mr. Osgood, and the Rev. Dr. Chapin have been severally applied to for a copy of the result of council. If it should be obtained, it will be forwarded to the Editors of the Disciple.

Notice of some attacks upon liberal Christians at New-York.— There have lately appeared at New-York various exhibitions of the same spirit which formerly showed itself in the Panoplist, while that work had an existence; but which seems now to be almost repressed in our neighbourhood by the decided expression of public opinion. There are many things of this sort which we are very willing to pass by without remark; because we believe that we can rely securely upon the honorable feelings of the community, and upon the prevailing sense of pro-

priety and justice in our part of the country ; and because we believe, if we may be permitted to say it, that we may trust for the confutation of these attacks to the general character of the great body of Christians who think with us. We pass them over the more readily also, because they are in truth nothing less than gross offences against common morality, upon which a man of correct principles can animadvert but in one mode—in the language of severe reprobation. This language it is not pleasant to use, however justifiable may be the occasion ; and considering the rapid progress with which correct opinions in religion, and what is far better, correct feelings concerning religion, are making their way, we trust that we shall not often think it necessary or advisable, to remark at any length upon the very improper methods by which an effort is sometimes made to oppose their progress. We have, however, determined to say a word or two at this time with regard to a few which have come to our knowledge.

In our number for September and October of the last year, we reviewed the pamphlet of the Rev. Mr. Feltus of New-York, the purpose of which was to show the near alliance between Unitarianism and Mahometanism. We are not at all disposed, however, to be angry with Mr. Feltus ; and we have no doubt that he feels a considerable degree of self-complacency in the circumstance, that his production has attracted so much of our notice, as well as received a very able answer at New-York. To speak plainly, for we cannot allow ourselves room for much circumlocution, there was nothing remarkable about his pamphlet, but its silliness ; except, indeed, that it was written with a decency of style, and moderation of feeling, which in a moral point of view put him far above some of his clerical brethren of the same city. In turning back to our review, we regret to find that we have not spoken more particularly of the full and satisfactory answer which it received from Henry D. Sewall, Esq. of New-York.

Since the pamphlet of Mr. Feltus, has appeared a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Spring, of which many of our readers may recollect that some account was published not long since in the Boston Daily Advertiser, accompanied with an extract from the eloquent and powerful answer which it called forth. The sermon is entitled with singular infelicity, "*A Tribute to New-England*," for it contains nothing which would give it claim to a moment's attention, except several pages of virulent abuse of New-England. The rest of the discourse is distinguished only by its barrenness and triteness of thought, its want of propriety in the use of language, a general clumsiness of expression, and one or two

blunders in matters of history. It is the production of a very ordinary and undisciplined mind; and if it be true that its writer holds a very considerable rank among the preachers of New-York, we have only to regret that the standard of preaching is not higher in that city. In this *TRIBUTE* to New-England the author tells us that 'her growth and prosperity has been attended by a sensible and humiliating degeneracy;' 'that there is a manifest declension of public morals in the different states of New-England;' that 'a regard for the institutions of the gospel is found now, with few exceptions, only on the page of some antiquated statute-book, or inscribed on the tomb of Puritanism.'—But to say the truth, we believe that he did not mean to assert quite so much as is affirmed in this last quotation; his language, we suspect, in this instance, outran his temper; the sentence from which we have last quoted being somewhat long, we imagine that he blundered on to the conclusion, without perceiving the connexion of meaning, or the sense which he had actually expressed. But we proceed: 'There are comparatively few in the metropolis of New-England upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;' that is, there are but few Christians in Boston. "A faith is inculcated from some of the pulpits of New-England, which so far from being humbling to the pride of man, commends itself to the unrenewed heart, and constitutes precisely the resting place for a mind awake to its obligations, and determined to maintain its rebellion against the Most High:—a faith, which the purest self-righteousness demands, and with which the most unyielding impenitence is satisfied;—a faith, which mocks at the seriousness and spirituality and self-devotement of true religion, and which considers all the tenderness of an awakened conscience, all anxiety for the salvation of the soul, all the solemnities of conviction for sin, as well as 'all joy and peace in believing,' the object of ridicule and sarcasm;—a faith which relaxes the obligations of personal and domestic religion; which makes no scruple in allowing ministers and people an occasional indulgence in the more refined and fashionable vices; and which often descends low enough to caricature the simplicity and purity of better days."

Indecent and infamously false as all this is, we are assured on authority which we cannot doubt, that the sermon as delivered was still more offensive; and that the author, before committing it to the press, thought proper to soften and repress some of the language, which he was shameless enough to utter from the pulpit. There is but one mode of speaking of such outrageous calumny. It constitutes essentially the same crime with that of

the common defamer. It manifests a spirit, which, if exercised in a way not very dissimilar *against an individual*, instead of a great number of individuals, the humanity of our laws would indeed punish only with imprisonment and hard labour, but which in other countries less merciful, might lead its possessor to make his next public exhibition in the pillory instead of the pulpit.

Addison, in one of his Spectators, tells of a country clergyman, who having a quarrel with the squire of his parish, threatened to pray for him by name before the whole congregation. We believe that we have sometimes been prayed for in a similar spirit. But if the accounts which we have heard be correct, some of the clergy of New-York have used language and manifested feelings in their addresses to the Deity, in relation to the Unitarians of that city, which exceed in brutal profaneness any thing of the sort of which we recollect to have heard. The clergy of a city have, we believe, no small influence not merely upon the religious and moral character of its inhabitants, but upon the state of intellectual improvement, of taste, and of genuine refinement of feeling and manners. By their weekly services, they determine in a great degree the manner in which religion shall be presented to the minds of men; whether in its true character, or as something repulsive and odious. The opinions which they inculcate may either enlighten and improve, or debase and confound the understandings of their hearers. They may do much to give them a taste for correct reasoning and genuine eloquence; or they may accustom them to extravagant and unmeaning declamation, and call upon them to give up the exercise of their own judgments, and rest satisfied with the confident assertions of their teachers, who are dogmatical in proportion to their incapacity to gain credit for their doctrines in any other way. They may do much to produce true liberality of feeling; or they may excite a vulgar, intemperate bigotry, which frequently exists, when the zealots who are actuated by it, neither know for what they are contending, nor what they are opposing. By inculcating religion in its true character as bearing directly upon the social duties, and demanding from us constant exertions to promote the moral and physical good of our fellow-creatures, they may indirectly do much to lessen the mass of vice and misery which is constantly accumulating in great cities. And on the other hand, by a kind of teaching, the tendency of which is to make men narrow-minded and violent in believing their doctrines, or profligate in despising them, they may contribute no inconsiderable aid to the prevalence of irreligion and immorality. We do think that the condition of that city is not a little to be lamented, in which any considerable proportion of

the clergy are distinguished by the spirit, which we have now felt it our duty to expose.

We should do injustice to our own feelings, if we forbore to mention the admirable answer to Dr. Spring by a member of the Unitarian Society at New York. We should give some extracts from it, but one of considerable length has already appeared in the number of the Daily Advertiser before referred to, and the pamphlet itself is for sale in our bookstores. While there are men among the Unitarians of New York who think and write like the author of this pamphlet; and we know of more than one of their number of whom any city might be proud; we think they have little to apprehend from any fair opposition which they are likely to encounter.

State of Religion in Holland.—[We think our readers will be interested by the following account of the state of religion in Holland, with which we have been favoured by a gentleman of the highest respectability, a native of that country. It was addressed in a private letter to one of the conductors of the Christian Disciple, and leave has been subsequently obtained for its publication.]

I have received from Holland various Reviews and Journals, published since I left that country in 1817, and observe in them, that religious opinions have undergone, and are undergoing a great change, from what they formerly were.

It appears, that a Synod of the Protestant Church for the kingdom of the Netherlands, was convened in 1817, and that among other enactments for the government of that church, it has been decreed: That at the examinations of the candidates for the ministry, no mention is to be made of the five points wherein the Arminians or Remonstrants disagree with the Calvinists; and that the subscription of ministers to the confession of faith, is to be made with this new and cautious condition, that they will teach and preach according to it, so far as they judge it to agree with the word of God.

The same Synod invited all the Protestant dissenters, i. e. the Anticalvinists, to partake with their churches of the Lord's Supper.

One Review, formerly characterized as ultra-orthodox, disclaims for the present clergy of Holland, any attachment to the Canons of the Synod of Dort of the year 1618, and asserts in several places, that it considers all the different doctrines among the Protestants, as speculative opinions, having no connexion with the *positive* doctrines of Christianity.

A Sermon has been published, pronounced by a Professor of Theology at Leyden, in which the doctrine of predestination is described as a frightful doctrine,—dishonourable to God,—and absurd,—representing the Deity as practising a contemptible deception upon his creatures, inviting and calling them to repentance and salvation, after having predetermined the everlasting misery of the greatest part of them. The reviewers, astonished at this open attack on a doctrine preached formerly by themselves, pronounce the terms here used to be too harsh, and insulting to a doctrine which during two centuries has made an interesting part of the popular belief. They agree, however, that the word Election is to be understood, as used concerning that which is chosen or preferred on account of some better quality and disposition, as Paul is named a chosen vessel, &c. They propose to explain the word in this sense, without mentioning or reproaching the former doctrine, and trust, that in so doing, the former erroneous explication will be forgotten, and the truth insensibly prevail.

Here we see in the church of Holland, another proof of the inexpediency and injurious tendency of human forms of belief, forced under the name of Creeds on Christian ministers. It is certainly not by a suddenly received light, that the clergy in Holland have discovered, that, as far as regards the doctrine of predestination at least, the Creed till of late unconditionally subscribed by them, and forced upon others, is not in accordance with the Bible. The growing disbelief in the doctrine has at length encouraged, perhaps forced them, to make this confession; they dare not however now do this from the pulpit, where they, as their brethren the Calvinists in this country, were formerly always insisting upon it. Their now determined silence on this point cannot however fail to be observed by a people, who like that of Scotland, have always put a high value on the articles of their Creed, and make them a subject for the exercise of their ingenuity; the fanatical Calvinists will cry out against them, and they are thus in danger of losing their influence and usefulness with their congregations. And when these congregations reflect, that their ministers have preached to them at least one doctrine, which they did not themselves believe; that the Creed and the Catechism remain the same, and their children are still obliged to learn and taught to believe them; is there not danger that this may lead the half informed, the great majority in all communities, to become sceptics, and entertain doubts on the essential parts of the christian religion? I do not blame the present clergy of Holland. Those who have gone before them have done the mischief. Creeds and Catechisms cannot be altered

in any country in Europe without convulsion, and unsettling the minds of the great bulk of the people, because they have been accustomed and taught to look on them as no less sacred than the bible. The safest way then certainly is, that now adopted by necessity. It is safest to introduce, as is now attempted to be done, not by authority of the synod or the churches, but by other means, different catechisms to take insensibly the place of the present one.

What the former orthodox party consider now as positive doctrines of christianity, appear to me to be few. In the great number of sermons published the last three years and mentioned in the reviews, there seems not even to have been an allusion to the doctrine of the Trinity, but in one instance, and the reviewers observe on it: "that many will be surprised, that the author has made use of the word Trinity." Professor Van der Palm, the celebrated Dutch biblical critic, and a most eloquent preacher, has published six volumes of sermons, which I have received. On the subject of the atonement he is positive; he does not however explain it as an infinite satisfaction to enable the Deity to be merciful towards his creatures, but for some reasons *inexplicable to us*, as a means by God ordained, and *necessary* to our salvation. He appears to me to have adopted, what Dr. Price calls the middle-scheme, and which the latter thinks the nearest the truth in the Gospel account. Professor Van der Palm speaks of Christ always in the language of the bible, and as the image of God's glory revealed on earth. That in him we see the Father; that his wisdom, power and love, are those of the Father, and that thus exalted, perfected and glorified by the Father, we must love and obey Christ as we do the Father. He represents Christ's present exaltation, "not because he was from eternity with the Father, but because *he has been made perfect* by obedience and suffering, and has obtained the delivery of men by his blood." Of the Holy Spirit he always speaks as of the power of God.

All the reviewers speak of these sermons, with unqualified praise, and recommend them as models. It seems to me obvious, therefore, that the doctrine of the Trinity is abandoned by the greater part and the most learned of the Dutch clergy, not less than the doctrine of Predestination. It is not long ago, however, that the slightest departure from the Creed established in 1618, was followed a formal dismissal of a minister from any of the established churches. The Synods and classes were particularly watchful for the preservation of the only true doctrines and the purity of the faith, as settled and declared by the Fathers of the Council of Dort.

One of the reviews, which has always, but with great caution, recommended a system of liberal christianity, comes now boldly forward and defends the perfect unity of God, on the ground of the plain and obvious declarations of the bible. It rejects and reprobates the imposition of human Creeds and systems of divinity. No professed Unitarians are more explicit on this point, than the writers in this review.

All this proves to me an amazing change in the religious opinions of my native country, which not many years ago was considered as the great bulwark of the orthodox and calvinistic system on the continent of Europe, and where that system has formerly found its most able and learned defenders. That this great change should be general, cannot be expected. But we may suppose the national general Synod of 1817, to have represented the opinions of the great majority of the Dutch Theologians, at least of the most learned and esteemed among them, and of the heads of the Universities. The perfect freedom allowed by this Synod to the ministers of religion, to take the bible as their standard of faith and doctrine, amounts to a virtual abandonment of any system of Orthodoxy. This, with the now open avowal and defence of the perfect unity of the Godhead, formerly branded and abhorred under the frightful name of Socinianism, must in time bring christianity back to its first purity and simplicity.

I see also in a work on theological subjects, that, in an introductory discourse, lately published by Professor Schulz of Breslau, the doubts about the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews are considered as finally settled, by what proofs or arguments is not mentioned, against the opinion that the Apostle Paul was the author of it. This was also the decision of the great Professor Valckenaer of Leyden, as appears by a recent posthumous publication from his writings, *Selecta e Scholis*.

Statements respecting Intemperance.—We have just seen the fourth annual Report of the Society for prevention of Pauperism in the city of New-York. The labours of this society are valuable, and we doubt not our readers will be interested in some quotations respecting intemperance—an important subject to which we have often called their attention. After stating “the sources of pauperism which attracted notice the last year, to be Intemperance, Ignorance, Criminal Prosecutions, Condition of Prisons, Gambling-Houses, Pardons, Lotteries, Want of Cleanliness, Emigration, Idleness and Want of Employment,” the Managers proceed as follows :

“During the last year, the evils of intemperance have not di-

minished. By the most accurate computation, there are 1680 licenses for retailing ardent spirits, in actual force, in the city of New-York ; making an average of *one tippling house to every fourteen houses* in this metropolis. And by adopting the mode of calculation used by the managers for the year 1819, to ascertain the sum annually expended in New-York, in the consumption of spirituous liquors, we arrive at the frightful result, that, in 1820, the sum of \$1,893,011 was squandered in the use of this single article ! And this, too, principally among that portion of our population, who are destitute of any permanent means of support, depending upon manual labour for their daily bread."

They add, that it is found that "the connexion between the evil under consideration, and the commission of a great portion of the minor offences which occupy our civil and criminal courts, is so close and intimate, that in proportion as the use of ardent spirits extends, crimes multiply, and vice versa. The records of the Court of Sessions show, that, as the number of licences has been augmented, assaults and batteries have multiplied ; and when the former has diminished, the latter have decreased. The whole number of complaints for assaults and batteries, during the last year, was 1061. During the first six months of that year, the number was 409 ; in the last six months 652. Here it is to be observed, that about 180 new licenses were granted in the early part of those last six months, in the absence of the mayor.

They add the following fact to prove that the use of ardent spirits is not *essential* to the strength of the most laborious.

"Mr. Allaire is the proprietor of a large foundry at Corlaer's-Hook. During the last season he employed upwards of sixty workmen, more than thirty of whom were men of families. In the course of the summer, he was informed that many of them were in debt ; and on investigating their concerns, with surprise he ascertained the fact, that every one who was in the habit of using ardent spirits, was involved to an extent beyond his ability to pay ; and, with a satisfaction equal to his former surprise, he learned the additional fact, that those who made no use of spirits, were in easy circumstances, and their children well provided for at school. Nor did a difference of wages from seventy-five cents to ten shillings per day, make any perceptible change in the situation of the former class of workmen.

With this picture before him, Mr. Allaire was at once induced to prohibit the use of ardent spirits altogether, in his shops, during working hours. But one person left his employ in consequence of this restriction ; and this man had borrowed of Mr. Allaire, while in his service, upwards of \$300 to pay grocery bills. In conclusion of his letter, Mr. Allaire observes : I have great reason to be pleased with the happy effects of this regulation. I find my interest better served ; and that those who, from excessive drinking, had be-

come of but little worth to me, and in many instances, of less to their families, have now become able and steady ; earn more money ; and their families as well as themselves, have expressed, in a language not to be misunderstood, the many comforts and the domestic happiness, which they enjoy in consequence."

Dedication at New-York.—The very neat and beautiful church, which has been during the last year erected in the city of New-York for the accommodation of a society of Unitarian worshippers, was dedicated to the service of Almighty God, on Saturday, Jan. 20th. The solemnities of the occasion were conducted by the Rev. Professor Everett, and the regular worship of the Lord's day has since been attended by a large and attentive audience. A church was gathered in the society Jan. 30th, and the ordinances have been regularly administered. We cannot but be grateful for that favour of Providence, by which this infant society has been led so pleasantly and prosperously to the accomplishment of this design ;—a design, which two years since was unthought of, and would have been deemed impracticable ; but now is happily completed, and opens a prospect for the diffusion of christian light and charity, which cannot be contemplated without religious joy.

New-York Collection of Psalms and Hymns.—We regret that circumstances have prevented our taking notice, in our Review, of the collection of Hymns, lately published in New-York by Henry D. Sewall, and used in the worship of the first Congregational Church of that place. We hope to do it in our next number. We must be satisfied with saying now, that we consider it as the best collection, upon the whole, of which we have any knowledge, and think it exceedingly desirable that it should be introduced to the worship of our churches in this town and vicinity. It is quite time that Belknap's Collection, which is in most general use, should give way to a better. It was excellent for its day, but its day is past. We need in the worship of our churches a larger variety of authors and subjects, and a more universal purity both of poetry and doctrine. Half of the psalms and hymns, at least, are such as never are and never can be used for the purposes of public devotion. We hope that those, who feel an interest in this most delightful part of religious service, will be led to think of the expediency of a change ; and now that they have access to a book of precisely the character they could desire, will not hesitate to adopt it.

The Unitarian Miscellany.—The first numbers of a monthly publication under this title, issuing at Baltimore, we have read with great satisfaction, and cordially welcome a work which gives promise of so powerful aid to the cause of religion and truth. We find in it an account of the formation of

The Baltimore Unitarian Society for the Distribution of Books : which we quote in part, that we may, if possible, by extending the knowledge of it, induce others to follow so good an example.

"The books distributed by the society shall be the Bible, and such other books as contain rational and consistent views of christian doctrines,

and are calculated to promote a correct faith, sincere piety, and a holy practice.

"Any person, on paying a subscription of *one dollar*, may become a member of the society, and be entitled to vote for officers. All subscriptions shall become due annually on the first day of January; and every member shall be considered an annual subscriber, until he gives notice to the secretary, that he wishes to withdraw himself from the society.

"The funds of the society shall be disposed of in purchasing or printing such books as the managers shall select or approve. A catalogue of these books shall be annually printed, with their respective prices annexed, and a copy sent to each subscriber, who shall be entitled to receive such books, as he may select out of the catalogue, to the amount of his subscription.

"All applications for books, must be made to the librarian, either in person or by a written order, but without any expense to the society for the postage of letters, or the conveyance of books. No person can receive books until his subscription is paid."

The foundation of a design somewhat similar has been laid in New-York, by the institution of a Library in the vestry-room of the first Congregational Church.

ORDINATIONS.—At Hingham, Jan. 17th, Mr. Charles Brooks was ordained to the pastoral care of the Third Church and Society. Rev. P. Whitney, of Quincy, offered the Introductory Prayer; Rev. Dr. Ware preached; Text, 2 Chron. xviii. 13. *And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, even what my God saith, that will I speak.* Rev. Dr. Kirkland made the ordaining prayer; Rev. Dr. Harris, of Dorchester, gave the charge; Rev. Mr. Francis, of Watertown, presented the fellowship of the churches; Rev. N. B. Whitney, of Hingham, made the concluding prayer.—It may be worth while to state, that, at the election of the candidate, the Church voted, that in this matter they had no right independent of, or prior to that of the congregation, and therefore acted in union with them, and not separately.

Feb. 21, Mr. Benjamin D. Wisner was ordained to the pastoral care of the Old South Church and Society in Boston. Introductory Prayer, Rev. S. E. Dwight. Sermon, Rev. Prof. Woods, of Andover; text, 1 Corinth. ii. 2. *I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.* Ordaining prayer, Rev. Dr. Holmes, of Cambridge. Charge, Rev. Dr. Osgood, of Medford. Right hand of fellowship, Rev. Mr. Huntington, of Bridgewater. Concluding prayer, Rev. J. Codman, of Dorchester.

At Ashby, Jan. 3, Mr. E. L. Bascom. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Foster, of Brighton.

At Waltham, Jan. 17, Mr. Sewall Harding, over the second Congregational Church and Society. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Ide, of Medway. The Dedication of the Meeting-House took place on the same day.

OBITUARY.

Died in West-Springfield, on the last day of the last year, the Rev. JOSEPH LATHROP, D.D. senior Pastor of the First Church in that place, in the 90th year of his age, and the 65th of his ministry.

This great and good man was a descendant in the fourth generation from the Rev. John Lathrop, formerly a minister of Barnstable, in England, who in the year 1634 came over, and settled in the ministry at Barnstable, in this state. The subject of this sketch was born at Norwich, in Connecticut, Oct. 31, 1731. He was an only son, and was deprived of his father at about the age of two years. At the age of eight years he was removed to Bolton, (Con.) where his mother formed a second marriage, and where

he continued till the year 1750, when he entered Yale College. While an under-graduate, he was distinguished, it is said, for the versatility of his genius, and the diligence with which he pursued his studies. In 1754 he received his first degree; soon after which he was engaged, as a grammar school master in Springfield, and at the same time commenced the study of theology in the family and under the direction of Rev. Mr. Breck of that place. In Jan. 1756, he received approbation, as a candidate for the ministry, and on the 25th day of the following August he was ordained in West-Springfield, where with few interruptions from ill-health, or any other cause, he continued to supply the pulpit for 62 years,—after which, a partial bereavement of sight induced him to relinquish the office of preaching, though he generally attended public worship, and occasionally officiated in prayer till a short time before his death. This blindness, which was so great as to render him incapable of reading, was attributed to a paralytic affection, which impaired the vigour of his health, and in some measure the vivacity of his mind.

Beside many occasional sermons, Dr. Lathrop published at different periods in his life six volumes, containing in the whole 175 sermons. The first volume was published in 1793, the second in 1796, the third in 1801, the fourth in 1806, the fifth in 1807, and the sixth in 1812. All these volumes have passed a second edition. It is needless to add that they have been well received.

In the character of Dr. Lathrop were combined in a remarkable degree the various qualities, which command at once our love and veneration. The native powers of his mind were probably far above the common lot of humanity; and by regular discipline and persevering exertion they were brought to a state of improvement, that is rarely surpassed. His apprehension was quick, his discernment clear, his invention fruitful, his imagination lively, his memory tenacious, and his judgment of course remarkably correct. He was characterised by the habits of observation and reflection; habits, which seem to have been early formed, and were continued through life, and which are of unspeakable importance in forming a useful or a great man. Hence every thing was instructive to himself, and in his preaching and conversation was rendered so to others. He copied with peculiar felicity one of the most distinguishing traits in the preaching of Him, "who spake as never man spake," that of interesting his hearers in moral and religious subjects by allusions to surrounding scenes and passing events.

Dr. Lathrop, as appears from his journal, had serious impressions of the importance of religion about the age of fourteen; though from remaining scruples he delayed a public profession till about the close of his collegiate life. Of the sincerity of his religious profession no one acquainted with his subsequent life could entertain any reasonable doubt. He drank deeply into the spirit of the gospel. In all his greatness he was meek, mild, and unassuming. It seemed to be no self-denial in him to refrain from every thing in air or conversation, that would remind others of his superiority to them. He united most happily the sincerity of the Christian with the courtesy of the gentleman, and the gravity of age with the vivacity of youth.

In the character of Dr. Lathrop, as a Man, as a Christian, and as a Minister, firmness and candour, zeal and moderation appeared in delightful harmony. He claimed the right of thinking and acting for himself, and that right he as readily conceded to his brethren. He was decidedly opposed to the intolerant and separating spirit of the times, and freely admitted all ministers of a regular standing and good character into his pulpit, though widely differing from him in religious speculations. His sentiments on this subject may be found in many of his sermons, but particularly in one, which he delivered in Boston, May, 1812, on the text, "we saw one casting out devils, &c." where among many excellent remarks, we find the following: "There are some, who lay too great weight on

certain peculiarities, which discriminate one sect from another, and denounce as hypocrites, fools and blind, all who cannot adopt the same. This illiberal spirit is often more injurious to true religion, than the errors which it reprobates. There are errors of opinion, which are inconsistent with religion; and we usually see their effects in a licentious and immoral life. Against these we should contend earnestly. But, errors which have no tendency to corrupt the heart, and vitiate the manners, and which do not appear to have this effect, ought to be treated with tenderness and candour.

"Our Saviour here instructs the ministers of his religion to maintain a conciliating candour toward one another, and toward all who profess to be his friends. His immediate disciples he was now training up to be public teachers. While he gradually opened to them the scheme of his religion, he inculcated upon them humility, gentleness and prudence, as necessary to success in the work, in which they were to be employed. The man in our story, not being so fully instructed in the doctrines of Christ, as they were, had not light to follow them in every step, but still he was a friend to Christ. If they wished him to follow them, they should have invited him into their company by a winning and attractive charity; not have kept him at a distance by a repulsive pride and intolerance. We may think a brother has imbibed certain errors, unfavourable to religion. What shall we do? Shall we separate him from our company, and deny him all brotherly and ministerial intercourse? No; this will disgust him. This will excite in him, a prejudice against us. This will place him at a greater distance from us. Every man loves society, especially the society of those who are in the same profession. If he cannot enjoy it in one place, he will seek it in another; and perhaps he will mingle with some who will confirm him in his errors. By our friendly intercourse and united labours, we may be fellow-helpers to the truth; but by reciprocal criminations and reproaches, we shall weaken the common cause, and give advantage to the common adversary."

In sermon 6th, vol. iii. we find the following passage: "If because we imagine ourselves more pure, more wise, or more sound in faith, than our brethren, we exclude them from our charity, bid them stand by themselves, and warn them not to come near us in acts of holy communion, our temper is utterly unlike that of the blessed above."

In religious speculations Dr. Lathrop has been supposed a Trinitarian, and what has generally been called a Moderate Calvinist. In the first sermon of his first volume, he argues that Christ was not a creature, from the fact of his having been employed in creating the world; and in several places in the 3d volume he may be thought to admit and even to vindicate some of the most exceptionable doctrines of the Calvinistic Creed, and among others those of Election and total depravity. But it is apparent from many other passages, that he did not even in speculation carry these points to the greatest extreme. Commenting on the parable of the tares, sermon 7th, vol. iv. he observes of the servants of the proprietor, "They ask, as was natural, whence came the tares?" They never once suspected, that their master sowed them, as some servants have since suspected." In another place, vol. iii. sermon 3d, he says, "Whatever doubts we may have concerning our own election, we may make it sure, by adding to our faith the virtues and works of the gospel." Again, sermon 7th, it is said, "Let no one imagine, that the prayers, the reformation and endeavours of awakened sinners, are abomination to God; for he who hath wrought them to these things is God, who hath given them the convincing and awakening influences of his spirit." And again, sermon 10th, "It is often asked whether the unregenerate can do any thing of themselves, which has a tendency to their conversion? But the answer is, They who enjoy the gospel are not left to themselves. If you suppose a man under the power of vicious inclinations, and at the same time destitute of all means

of religious knowledge, and without any influence from the spirit of God, you then have the idea of a sinner properly left to himself. But this is not your case. You have the gospel in your hands, and it is daily proclaimed in your hearing. There is an agency of the divine Spirit attending it; and you have been, and, we hope, still are in some degree the subjects of this agency. With these advantages, there is something which you may do."

But whatever Dr. Lathrop might believe in regard to the doctrines, named above, he did not consider them as the grand essentials of the gospel. He did not adopt them, as the controlling principles of interpreting the scriptures. Far from this; in his exposition of the text—"Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved;" (Vol. ii. sermon 49,) he gives substantially the same view of the faith, required in regard to this point, which Mr. Locke in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* has given. In enumerating the most efficacious doctrines of the gospel, (sermon 27th, vol. ii.) he does not mention one of those, which are peculiarly Calvinistic. In all the volumes of his sermons, excepting the third, these doctrines are almost entirely omitted, and most of the sermons in the third, in which he professedly gives the whole Christian system, relate chiefly to the spirit and practice of religion. It is remarkable too, that his half century sermon, as also those of his sixtieth anniversary, which might be considered, as solemn valedictories to his people, were wholly of a practical nature.

Dr. Lathrop was decidedly opposed to that exclusion of reason from religious inquiries, which has been a source of numberless errors. "Reason and revelation," says he, sermon 31, vol. ii. "choose to walk hand in hand; and nothing can be more unkind than to set them at variance."

The principles of religion are not indeed to be settled by human authority. But the name of such a man, as Dr. Lathrop, will have influence; and hence it becomes a matter of importance, that this part of his character should be rightly understood.

Dr. Lathrop's sermons are perhaps the richest treasure of the kind, this country has yet produced. It cannot be supposed, that 175 sermons from the same pen should *all* be of the highest order. Many of them however will bear an honourable comparison with the best English compositions, and will probably be transmitted to the latest posterity, in which the language is known. They abound in important and original thoughts; are almost always instructive, and often impressive. In point of method and style, with few exceptions, they are among the best models that can be proposed for imitation. Their style is distinguished for simplicity, perspicuity and neatness; and they well deserve a place in every considerable library, public or private.

Dr. Lathrop was remarkable for his habits of industry, as appears from the fact; that while he was respectable for the extent of reading, he left in manuscript about FIVE THOUSAND sermons. This industry is worthy of admiration, though to a person of less genius than he, the particular mode, in which it was exerted, could not be recommended.

To a late period in life he retained his native vigour of body and mind. For many years he waited with cheerful expectation the dissolution of nature, hoping for the mercy of God through Jesus Christ unto eternal life. "Blessed are the dead, that die in the Lord; for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have on hand a great number of communications of very various merit, to some of which we shall give place, but of none is it necessary to speak particularly.

END OF NO. I. VOL. III.